REDEMPTION AND THE OTHER: THE SUPERNATURAL NARRATOR AND THE INTERTEXTUAL (SUB)VERSION OF THE MILTONIC COMMAND

Robert Douglas Gowdy, B.A., M.A.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

May 2000

APPROVED:

Giles Mitchell, Major Professor
Thomas Preston, Committee Member
Scott Simpkins, Committee Member
Lynn Eubank, Chair of Graduate Studies in English
James T. F. Tanner, Chair of the Department of English
C. Neal Tate, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse School of Graduate Studies

Gowdy, Robert Douglas, Redemption and the other: the supernatural narrator and the intertextual (sub)version of the Miltonic command. Doctor of Philosophy (English), May 2000, 135 pp., references, 59 titles.

In literary discourse from the Genesis creation myth through John Milton's *Paradise Lost* and beyond, Eve has been patriarchally considered to be the bringer of Sin and Death into the world. In *Paradise Lost* Eve is depicted as deceiving Adam into the Fall by way of the Serpent. *Paradise Lost* creates a Miltonic command that helps to further blame Woman for Sin and Death. Milton's poem is based on the Genesis creation myth written by Canaanite authors. In this myth the Canaanite authors wished to rid the world of Goddess worship and, by humanizing Eve, they successfully obliterate that form of worship. As a result of this obliteration of the Goddess, Eve, as a humanized form of the ancient Goddess Asherah, remains unredeemed for her sin and forever held to blame.

Throughout what Michel Foucault calls the archive, or discourse in which power resides, Eve/Woman continues to be seen by patriarchal discourse as to blame for the Fall. There has never been a successful redemption for Eve in the archive. Although Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa* has been suggested as a successful redeemer of Eve, Clarissa's blatant *will to death* and, therefore, *will to power* precludes a successful redemption of Eve. The successful Redemption of Eve comes in Thomas Hardy's novel *Tess of the D'Urbervilles.* By way of Tess's Goddess stature and her self-sacrifice at the end of the novel she successfully effects a redemption of Eve/Woman. As Goddess, Tess enters a state of *otherwise than being* in the intertext and becomes the Supernatural narrator who narrates both her own story and the unsaid story of the Goddess in the

mythic narrative. By way of this *otherwise than being* as the Supernatural narrator, Tess takes on Eve's blame and intertextually subverts the Miltonic command by narrating the Goddess's prehistorical purity. As a result, then, Eve is redeemed and the Goddess's unsaid story is reinstated in the mythic narrative.

TABLE: OF CONTENTS

Page

Chapter

CHAPTER 1

PARADISE LOST AND THE MILTONIC MYTH/COMMAND

John Milton's *Paradise Lost* is an epic poem in which the poem's narrator sets out to "justify the ways of God to *men*"[1] (1.26; emphasis added). Milton's objective in *Paradise Lost* was to create, by way of epic poetry, a firm and lasting master-narrative that interprets the events described in Genesis. Given the lasting achievement of *Paradise Lost*, Milton's objective was extraordinarily successful in that, "The project of epic is to fix the values (and not only the *new* values) of the society, to specify them as *eternal essences* and *immobilize them* in the heightened and decorated textuality of verse" (Belsey 36; emphasis added). Because the Bible was so "central to all intellectual as well as moral life" in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Hill 20), Milton's epic project was to fix and immobilize in *Paradise Lost* those biblical values so that they became eternal essences in the "sociolect" (metalinguistic social discourse) (Riffaterre, *Semiotics of Poetry* 54). The "Miltonic splendor" that embodies *Paradise Lost* thus became, due to its extraordinary literary power and success, myth in itself, a Miltonic myth "firmly fixed" in the *archive* (Bloom, *Misreading* 125).

Based on the creation myth related in Genesis 1-3, Milton's version in *Paradise Lost* so powerfully and interpretively recasts the myth that it approaches, if not mandates, "a new scripture" in and of itself (Shattuck 54). As a form of "new scripture," then, *Paradise Lost* stands in juxtaposition to Genesis overshadowing the "original" biblical

[1] Merritt Y. Hughes, ed., *John Milton*: *Complete Poems and Prose,* (New York: Macmillan, 1957). All references to *Paradise Lost* are from this edition.

account and is the version of creation that most people remember. As a result of this sociolectic remembrance in society's consciousness, it is both acceptable and accurate to refer to what Milton created in *Paradise Lost* as *myth* (MacCaffrey 2). The myth Milton creates in his poem conforms to the interpretation of myths in general albeit a *new*, Miltonic myth that is "intended" to be read—as all myths are intended to be read—"as *true*, and as *history*" (17). Clearly *Paradise Lost* has indelibly established itself in/as history, particularly literary history, and as a result has exerted a "decisive influence on subsequent history," as well as the literature that followed (17). Two examples of *Paradise Lost's* decisive influence on history and literature can be found in its symbolic use of the Fall, and in its use of the apple as the fruit that Eve takes and eats from the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. Nowhere in the Bible is the word "*fall*" used to "designate what happened" to Adam and Eve (Shattuck 50). Nor is the fruit that Eve takes and eats from the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil ever described in the Bible as an apple. However, Milton's effective use of both of these symbolic descriptions in *Paradise Lost* has, since its publication, dominated the collective, sociolectic memory—as well as the intertext—to the extent that they permanently remain as "factual" components of the original Old Testament creation myth. Although Milton's use of the Fall and the apple in the narrative of *Paradise Lost* are but two examples of the poem's enduring memory in the sociolect, they help to demonstrate just how "permanently" archival the poem became after its entrance into literary discourse.

Because *Paradise Lost*, by way of sociolectic memory, exerts such "permanent authority" over literary history and literary discourse, it thus resides in the sociolect as an *archive*. However, what is the archive? In the case of *Paradise Lost*, its archival nature

resides in its differentiated identity as a literary discourse, a literary discourse that is "specified in [its] own duration" (Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge* 129). The archive therefore "defines a particular level" of discursive performance by which a discourse enters the sociolectic memory as a "unique [event]" (129). As a unique, discursive event, then, *Paradise Lost* as archival discourse "refers . . . to the *arkh*⬣ in the *physical, historical*, or *ontological* sense, which is to say to the originary, the first, the principal, the primitive, in short the commencement" (Derrida, *Archive Fever* 2). *Paradise Lost* is, therefore, a "commencement" in that, as archival discourse, it refers to *arch*⬣, which

> . . . names at once the *commencement* and the *commandment*. This name apparently coordinates two principles in one: the principle according to nature or history, *there* where things *commence*—[again,] physical, historical, or ontological principle—but also the principle according to the law, *there* where men and gods *command*, *there* where authority, social order are exercised, *in this place* from which *order* is given—nomological principle. (1)

With the opening lines of *Paradise Lost* Milton immediately establishes a *commencement*, a commencement that has "lasting authority among readers" (Shattuck 62). The lasting *authority* in the commencement of *Paradise Lost* resides in the dual nature of the *arkh*⬣, or *archive*, in which also resides the authoritative signification of *commandment*. The poem begins:

> Of Man's First Disobedience, and the Fruit
> Of that Forbidden Tree, whose mortal taste
> Brought Death into the World, and all our woe,

With loss of *Eden*, till one greater Man

Restore us, and regain the blissful Seat,

Sing Heav'nly Muse, that on the secret top

Of *Oreb*, or of *Sinai*, didst inspire

That Shepherd, who first taught the chosen Seed,

In the Beginning how the Heav'ns and Earth

Rose out of *Chaos*. . . . (1.1-10; emphasis added)

Readers of *Paradise Lost*, particularly seventeenth-century readers, are meant "to *remember* that the events [described in] the poem *have already occurred*" (Ferry, *Milton's Epic Voice* 47; emphasis added). Milton's invocation in *Paradise Lost* is, therefore, a commencement because it recalls the commencement of Genesis 1.1, when it states, "In the beginning. . . ." Although *Paradise Lost* recalls Genesis 1.1 as a commencement, or a "that which has come before," it also authorizes itself as a supplementary commencement that establishes a new history to be remembered in the sociolect as also having "*already occurred*." With the discursive statement "In the beginning" bound in Genesis 1.1 and in *Paradise Lost*, Milton authorizes "two orders of order," one "*sequential*" and the other "*jussive*" (Derrida, *Archive Fever* 1). Sequentially, *Paradise Lost* enters both (literary) history and the intertext as a master-narrative that draws its discursive power from Genesis by standing as a mirror to its theologic authority, thus creating a reflectivity that amplifies the biblical account beyond its original *remembrance*. Milton's reflective amplification of Genesis in *Paradise Lost* consequently establishes the poem as a *jussive* narrative that *becomes* a commandment in archival discourse. Because archival discourse is where power, or the *law*, resides,

Milton's reflective amplification of Genesis becomes a successful *attempt* to "inscribe the Word in the word" (Belsey 20). Milton takes the Word inscribed in the forty Old Testament verses and multiplies them

> . . . by a factor of four hundred to produce sixteen thousand unrhymed decasyllabic lines of diversified poetry. The epic narrative incorporates powerful dramatic scenes, a protestant [*sic*] and somewhat heretical theology of good and evil, a complex psychology that fluctuates from intensely human to unexpectedly playful, and a poetic diction like a powerful inboard motor that drives the story through wondrous cosmo-logical and mythological spaces. *Paradise Lost* displays a cosmic *imagination* that produces episodes as grandiose as the scenes in the Sistine Chapel. (Shattuck 56; emphasis added)

Paradise Lost is, indeed, a powerful display of Milton's cosmic imagination in that the poem's epic narrative *imaginatively* transcends its narrative patriarch, Genesis. Milton's inscription of the Word in the word is an intervention by Milton in an effort to *fix* God's commandment in *Paradise Lost* as an absolute, since nowhere in *Paradise Lost* is God's authority questioned (Belsey 15). *Paradise Lost* is, in a word, the *Word*, in which the reader "learns the truth" by way of the epic narrative where the truth is "guaranteed by the authority of the *narrative voice*, by the Muse, by the Scriptures, by God. . . . As a master-narrative (perhaps the greatest ever), *Paradise Lost* proclaims the truth" (84; emphasis added). Truth is, therefore, power, and the "truth" that resides in the Word of *Paradise Lost* becomes a *commandment*, a Miltonic commandment that

supersedes its archival precursor, Genesis, by way of the authority *in* the narrative voice. However, who, or what, constitutes the essence of the narrative voice in *Paradise Lost*?

In *Milton's Epic Voice: The Narrator in* Paradise Lost, Anne Ferry states that the narrative voice in *Paradise Lost* is an "organic poetic device" (8), "a deliberate . . . invention" that can in no way (other than by way of "vagueness") refer "to the speaker in the poem as 'Milton'" (20-1). However, as the author of the Miltonic command(ment) that is the Word in *Paradise Lost*, readers can

> . . . conceive of John Milton as theomorphic, *a kind of mortal god*, which is how our high Romantic precursors conceived him. *The true God* of *Paradise Lost* is *the narrator*, rather than the Urizenic schoolmaster of Souls scolding away on his throne or the Holy Spirit invoked by the Arian Milton, not as a part of a Trinity, and not as Milton's muse either, since the muse for Milton is simply his own *indwelling* power, his interior paramour. Spirit and power are one concept *in Milton*; they unite in the trope of Messiah, and they come close to uniting dangerously in the figure of Milton himself; not just as the voice speaking the poem, *but as the maker* of both an older and a newer testament than the testaments already available to him. (Bloom, *Sacred Truths* 92; emphasis added)

As a Puritan theologian, Milton possessed a "rocklike ego" through which he was "persuaded that he incarnated truth," a theomorphic, Miltonic incarnation that is conveyed in *Paradise Lost* by way of the *indwelling* power of the poem's narrative (91). As a kind of mortal god, then, Milton, as author, becomes the indwelling presence-in-absence of the Father, which is in essence the Miltonic narrator as the incarnate truth *in*

the poem. Milton thus becomes *the signifier* in *Paradise Lost* that "functions to realize an order of being" in language that "did not exist before" (Boothby 127). That order of being, or Being, in the language of *Paradise Lost* is the "trace" of Milton in the poem who, as the incarnation of truth, becomes the "disappearance of origin" that is constituted "reciprocally by [the] nonorigin" of the Being as origin (Derrida, *Of Grammatology* 61). By the sheer force of his indwelling power, Milton's muse is Milton, the voice speaking the poem as a "religious invocation" of "the-Name-of-the-Father" that "is the signifier of the function of the [F]ather" (Handelman, *The Slayers of Moses* 157). As Maurice Kelly points out in his *This Great Argument: A Study of Milton's* De Doctrina Christiana *as a Gloss upon* Paradise Lost, the "attributes of Milton's Muse correspond to those assigned in the *De doctrina* to virtue and power of God the Father," thus

> . . . when John Milton sought divine guidance for his supreme poetical effort, he addressed a Muse who is separate and apart from the Third Person of the Trinity. Influenced by his anti-Trinitarian dogma . . . , he invoked a *personification* of the various attributes of God the Father, and thus turned for inspiration and knowledge not to what he considered a subordinate figure but rather to the Father himself—the very fountainhead of all wisdom and enlightenment. (117-8; emphasis added)

As a result of this *personification* of the various attributes of God the Father in *Paradise Lost*, Milton assumes the indwelling power of the Name-of-the-Father "in the domain" of the poem's "being" (Heidegger, *Poetry, Language, Thought* 224). Milton is *the maker* of/in *Paradise Lost*, and although he remains "invisible" in the narrative, he nevertheless *attempts* to "preserve his presence" as a "presencing being" that speaks the

poem (226-7). Drawing on his indwelling power *as muse*, Milton enters the symbolic order (language) of *Paradise Lost*, which is "governed by the 'Name-of-the-Father'" (Handelman, *Slayers of Moses* 138) that "sustains the structure of desire with the structure of the law" (Lacan, *Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis* 34). Although Milton's invisible, indwelling power seeks to locate a "presencing being" in the symbolic order of *Paradise Lost*, or the Lacanian Other "longing to be the origin of language" and the "source of meaning and truth," his presencing being is forever "haunted by the *lack* which insures difference" (Belsey 34). Milton's presencing being in *Paradise Lost* does become the Other, as does the poem itself, in that Milton enters the symbolic order that is *Paradise Lost* by way of his "presencing" in the poem; however, the lack inherent in desire as it traverses the endless chain of signification renders Milton's presence in the poem only a trace, "the sign of the absent other" (Handelman, *Slayers of Moses* 166). There is, then, only a trace of Milton as Being in the poem. As the sign of the absent other Milton's Being in *Paradise Lost* is marked by absence, an absence that "*loom*[*s*] *through some other history*" (Milton's *other* history of Creation), whose narration is "*in the other*, and *out of* the other" (Felman 125). The other here is both the reader *and* Milton because the narration is *in the other* as narrator, and *out of* the other as both reader and narrator.

The "reader-narrator" of *Paradise Lost*, as other, enters the poem's language through the chain of signification that constitutes the poem's narration. The poem thus becomes the Other, or the unconscious, to the reader-narrator's other because the poem's narrative generates itself through the reader-narrator. In essence, then, Milton, along with the reader, becomes a reader of his own narration as the *other in the Other* since,

according to Jacques Lacan, "the unconscious subject is presumed to be able to read" (qtd. in Felman 125). In the Otherness, or unconsciousness, of the narration in *Paradise Lost*, Milton attempts a reading in "*libido sciendi*, 'the lust to know'," an archival, libidinal desire traversing the poem's chain of signification that endlessly seeks to fulfill the desire for knowledge (Shattuck 68). A "meaning" that Milton seeks to *presence* in *Paradise Lost* is *knowledge*, a knowledge that is "the very fountainhead of all wisdom and enlightenment." This knowledge, however, is a knowledge that the reader-narrator is barred from, which is a *lack* of knowledge that the indwelling power of the Other seeks to fulfill in *Paradise Lost*. For the reader-narrator, then, it is

> precisely out of [the] *lack of knowledge* that the reading-process springs, [a]nd the very act of reading implies at the same time the assumption that knowledge *is*, exists, but is *located in the Other*: in order for reading to be possible, there has to be knowledge in the Other (in the text, for instance), and it is that knowledge in the Other, of the Other, which must be *read*, which has to be appropriated, taken from the Other. The [other, or reader-narrator] . . . thus postulates that the signified [it] is barred from, the sense of what [it] does not know, exists and is in fact possessed by—or possessing—someone else. Knowledge haunts. The question of meaning as such, which seems indeed to haunt [*Paradise Lost*] . . . , can thus be formulated as the question: "*What is it that knows*?*"* "If the unconscious has taught us anything," writes Lacan, "it is first of all this: that somewhere, in the Other, 'it' knows. It knows because 'it' is supposed by those signifiers the subject is constituted by (. . .). The very status of knowledge implies

> that some sort of knowledge already exists, in the Other, waiting to be taken, seized." (Felman 157-8)

As the Other, then, "*Paradise Lost* knows," even though Milton's "intended meaning died in the moment the text *came into being*, and the text is necessarily *more than the author conceived or knew*" (Belsey 64; emphasis added). The text of *Paradise Lost* nevertheless came *into being*, through Milton, as the *Other that knows* in the poem, a trace-of-Being-in-the-Other that contains a knowledge beyond what the author originally conceived or knew. The knowledge in *Paradise Lost* that goes beyond what the author originally conceived or knew is "forbidden knowledge," an unconscious *libido sciendi* that is always already deferred in Milton's consciousness as a Nietzschean "fantastic commentary on an unknown, perhaps unknowable, *but felt text*" (qtd. in Boothby 225; emphasis added). The text of *Paradise Lost* is indeed "felt" by the reader-narrator, a text in which the Other represents a form of Being that possesses the forbidden knowledge that must be taken or seized in the process of reading. The Other, as text or language, is, according to Martin Heidegger, "the house of Being" (qtd. in Boothby 211). As the house of Being, therefore, language is "that by which being is realized," a "Being-in" that locates the Miltonic Other as a potential Being-in-the-poem (212). However, the Miltonic *Other that knows* in *Paradise Lost* is, in effect, really a trace-of-Being-in-the-text that contains a forbidden knowledge beyond what the author originally conceived. As a trace, then, or trace-of-Being-in-the-text, Milton's "presence in the poem becomes *differance* (Derrida, *Of Grammatology* 62), a differance that

> points to both difference and deferment, and to their *consequence*. The signifier cannot make present, even in imagination, a single, full,

> masterable meaning-which-is-truth. It cannot incarnate the Logos. At the same time there is no meaning (and no Logos) outside signification. Differance "maintains our relationship with that which we necessarily misconstrue, and which *exceeds the alternative of presence and absence*." (Belsey 24; emphasis added)

Although, as Other, *Paradise Lost* does know, what "it" knows is only the "truth" as inscribed by Milton. Milton's inscription is a "felt" text that successfully immobilizes in the archive an amplified account of the eternal essences found in Genesis 1-3. The poem recasts the original creation myth as outlined in Genesis by means of Milton's indwelling power as the *Other that knows*, the Other that inhabits only a trace-of-Being-in-the-text *as differance*. As differance, Milton's "truth" in *Paradise Lost* comes with "consequence[s]" that may cause his master-narrative to "[exceed] the alternative" of his presence-in-absence as the "meaning" in the poem. How, then, might Milton's master-narrative go beyond the alternative of his presence-in-absence as a trace-of-Being-in-the-text that has, at least according to the archive, successfully recast the original creation myth as a jussive narrative *fixed* in the sociolect? And what is the forbidden knowledge contained in *Paradise Lost* that transcends the narrative and looms through some other history, a knowledge that the reader-narrator is barred from and must, therefore, appropriate?

Because *Paradise Lost* knows, the Other that is the text of *Paradise Lost* knows based on the Lacanian psychoanalytic theory of the "the subject who is supposed to know" (Lacan, *Concepts of Psycho-Analysis* 224). Lecturing on Ren■ Decartes' *cogito*, Jacques Lacan identifies the field of Decartes' knowledge at the level of a "vaster subject,

the subject supposed to know, God" (224). In effect, then, "God is supposed to know" (225). Therefore, since Milton is the "*true God*" of *Paradise Lost*, the "*maker* of both an older and a newer testament than the testaments already available to him, Milton, as Other, assumes the Name-of-the-Father in the text and becomes a "vaster subject" that proclaims to know the "truth" absolutely. Milton's "intention" may be to have the reader

> [learn] the truth from *Paradise Lost*; that the epic tells the truth is guaranteed by *the authority of the narrative voice*, *by the Muse*, by the Scriptures, *by God*. Ultimately, only God can hold the truth in place, *authorize it against alternative knowledges* produced by free subjects. This truth [that the poem reveals] cements difference as opposition; it identifies its opponents as knaves and fools; it condemns the damned to hell. Truth is a despotism. It enlists subjects in obedience to an authority which needs no other justification. (Belsey 84; emphasis added)

As a result of this narrative *authority* in *Paradise Lost*, Milton's inscription of the "truth" in the poem is designed to cement the certainty that "[n]othing [no meaning other than that which is *in* the poem] is allowed to be . . . outside its scope" (Handelman, *Slayers* 39). This Miltonic conception of the "truth" contained in the word as *the Word* in *Paradise Lost* is analogous to the Derridean theory that "there is nothing outside the text" (Derrida, *Of Grammatology* 163), that a "text has no meaning outside textuality" (Belsey 104). In effect, Milton's narrative in *Paradise Lost* asserts its authority over the truth, thus assuming absolute *control* over the Word in the word that is the poem. But who actually has control over the "meaning" in *Paradise Lost*, the reader, the text, or the Miltonic presence-in-absence that is the trace-of-Being-in-the-text purporting to "justify

the ways of God to men"? Because the narrative in *Paradise Lost* shifts back and forth from time frame to time frame, the poem's narrative disjunction resembles the pattern of the unconscious as it incessantly turns from one independent "thought" to another. As a result of this unconscious, narrative "uncontrollability," the poem tends to slip both in and out of the narrator's and the reader's control (Fish, "Interpreting the *Variorum*" 70). Control of the narrative, if there indeed can be such a component as *narrative control*, seems to lie in a space somewhere in between the text and the reader. While reading *Paradise Lost*, or any text for that matter, the reader assumes the role of "fictitious reader," what Walker Gibson calls the "mock reader" (Gibson, "Authors, Speakers, Readers, and Mock Readers" 2). The mock reader is an "artifact," a "mask and costume" that the reader "takes on in order to experience the language" of any given text (2). In other words, the reader assumes the role of a fictitious character inhabiting an equivocal space in which he or she is addressed by the narrator/God of *Paradise Lost*. That equivocal space is what Wolfgang Iser calls the "virtual dimension of the text," a space that is not only "the text itself" but also the "imagination of the reader," the "coming together of the text *and* the imagination" (54; emphasis added) in a space that may also be called "*the text*." Milton addresses his poem to an all encompassing "us," an "us" by which Milton "throws his arm[s] around the mock reader," stating:

> Of that forbidden Tree, whose mortal taste
> Brought Death into the world, and all *our* woe,
> With loss of *Eden*, till one greater Man
> Restore *us*, . . . (1.2-5; emphasis added)

Therefore, "we" as readers of Milton's poem assume the role of "us" in *Paradise Lost*, an "us" that is an equivocal *character* (or characters, as the case may be) occupying that textual space between the imagination and the text.

The space between the text and the reader is the virtual dimension of the text wherein interpretation is effected, a space involving both the imagination of the reader and the self-consciousness of the text itself. Because the text in *Paradise Lost* resembles the unconscious in its incessantly sliding temporal signification, the text has a "self-consciousness" in which the poem *knows* and, as a result, what it knows successfully recasts the original creation myth as an "alternative," jussive narrative (Derrida, *Of Grammatology* 102). As the *true God* of *Paradise Lost* Milton produces a narrative myth in the poem that fixes in the sociolect (the metalinguistic *text* that is the virtual dimension of the text) a commandment that proclaims Woman to be the bringer of Sin and Death into the world. The reader-narrator, then, occupying that virtual dimension which *is* the text, falls prey to the poem's archival, jussive narrative, a narrative that (according to the Name-of-the-Father) purports to "control" the text (thus "assuming" control of the text *and* its "meaning") and, as a result, accepts the male supremacist command offered as *the truth*. Eve therefore becomes fixed in the archive as "the figure of Death" (Kerrigan 105) because when she eats from the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, she "knew not *eating Death*" (9.792; emphasis added). Eve, at least according to the "alternative" self-consciousness of Milton's archival text, does eat Death and "forever after" (and this phrase may become controversial later) becomes the bringer of Death into the world. In this one respect, at least, Milton's master-narrative goes beyond his presence-in-absence as a trace-of-Being-in-the-text in that it jussively fixes Eve in the archive as being

"responsible for man's mortality and fall from grace" (Figes 42). Although Milton's master-narrative appears to go beyond his presence-in-absence as a trace-of-Being-in-the-text, it still purports to have no meaning outside *the text* because it agrees with the archive. Archivally, Milton drew upon many sources during the creation of *Paradise Lost*; the Bible, mythology, his poetic precursors, contemporary political doctrine, and contemporary cultural attitudes, etc. However, as Eve Figes points out, Milton seems notably to represent in his poem (particularly in Book X) the views of the *Malleus Maleficarum* (*Hammer of Witches*), a "handbook" for witch hunters written by the inquisitors Heinrich Kramer and James Sprenger that was "[p]ublished shortly after the Papal Bull of 1484" (62, 82). In the *Malleus Maleficarum* the authors state that,

> there was a defect in the formation of the first woman, since she was formed from a bent rib, that is, a rib of the breast, which is bent as it were in a contrary direction to a man. And since through *this defect* she is an imperfect animal, she always deceives. (44; emphasis added)

In *Paradise Lost*, Milton's "[portrayal] of womanhood" through his representation of Eve seems to "bear a remarkable similarity" to that expressed by Kramer and Sprenger (Figes 81). In Book X, Adam's tirade against Eve after the Fall—which originates in Milton's presence-in-absence as the *true* God of *Paradise Lost*—becomes an archival commandment in the sociolect by reiterating the *Malleus Maleficarum*, stating:

> To trust thee from my side, imagined wise,
> Constant, mature, proof against all assaults,
> And understood not all was but a show
> Rather than solid virtue, *all but a rib*

> *Crooked by nature*, *bent*, as now appears,
> *More to the part sinister from me drawn,*
> Well if thrown out, as supernumerary
> To my just number found. (881-888; emphasis added)

The similarities between this passage in *Paradise Lost* and the passage from the *Malleus Maleficarum* are striking. It appears that Milton may have been familiar with the *Malleus Maleficarum* and that, "[l]ike earlier Christian writers," he held the view that woman was a "wicked, sensual snare laid for men" (Figes 81). By portraying Eve in this manner, Milton's master-narrative again goes beyond his presence-in-absence as a trace-of-Being-in-the-text, the Other that knows, and, although it does not authorize alternative knowledges outside the text, it redoubles the condemnation of Woman in the archive as a forcible meta-alternative to the original creation myth held in Genesis. In the archive, then, Milton's master-narrative expands and amplifies in the sociolect the signification that Eve/Woman

> was made responsible for man's mortality and fall from grace. This interpretation of the origin of undesirable things was to prove very useful for *a long time to come*, and served a double purpose. On the one hand it allowed man to assert his domination that much more forcibly, he literally had the whip hand and could go on punishing woman for what she was supposed to have done, thus justifying his domination, and on the other hand it allowed him to externalize all flaws and weaknesses in himself and make woman the embodiment of them, leaving himself strong and intact and morally superior. And since sexuality is always

> the Achilles heel in this arrangement not only do the strongest taboos surround sex, but it is woman's sexuality that he most loathes and fears. (42; emphasis added)

Although Milton attempts to *fix the Truth* in his master-narrative as the *Other that knows*, particularly with respect to its patriarchal commandment against Eve/Woman, it nevertheless exceeds his presence-in-absence as the true God of *Paradise Lost* by going beyond the virtual dimension of the text as a forcible, meta-alternative narrative in the archive. The reader-narrator, although meant to be confined to the text as Truth, is able to transcend the virtual dimension of the text to seek and appropriate the forbidden knowledge that he or she is barred from, a knowledge that looms through some other history and exceeds the archival, jussive narrative held in the Miltonic command that is the patriarchal narrative of *Paradise Lost*.

Roger Shattuck suggests that the forbidden knowledge that Milton attempts to *contain* in *Paradise Lost* is simply the textual "knowledge gained" in the poem/myth by Adam and Eve from the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil (67). However, I would suggest that the forbidden knowledge that Milton attempts to contain in the archive is the knowledge of the Goddess. This knowledge of the Goddess is the *other* history that looms throughout the myth as narrative, and is the forbidden knowledge that Milton and earlier Christian writers consciously, and unconsciously, attempt to suppress. However, as Rollo May points out, "[s]ince myths are beyond [or transcend] time, they could all be formed into one glorious narrative" (92). Milton, in essence, attempted to achieve just such a single, glorious mythologic narrative in *Paradise Lost*. But his attempt to inscribe the Word in the word as a *jussive* master-narrative *fixed* in the sociolect as the Miltonic

myth suggests either an ignorance of the fact that *"*[*m*]*yths* [are] *archetypal patterns in human consciousness*," or a clear attempt by Milton to suppress that mythologic knowledge held in human consciousness (37). Since myths are archetypal patterns that reside in human consciousness, as archetypes they are "the expression of the collective *unconscious*" (38; emphasis added). As an expression of human unconsciousness the *other* history of the Goddess must reside in the unconsciousness of myth and, as a result, is available for the reader-narrator to appropriate and interpret through the Other *as text*.

Milton as Other, particularly as *the Other that knows* in *Paradise Lost*, *attempts* to fix in the archive the Old Testament and early Christian doctrines that Eve "is clearly not divine: she is the *mortal* mother of all living *mortals*" (Shlain 115). However, the name Eve means "Mother of all Living," an "honorific" that "used to describe the Great Mother," the Mother Goddess (115). By representing Eve as being deprived of divine status the Old Testament authors perpetrate a "subtle artifice" by which the Feminine "is stripped of its sacrality" (115). Eve is, nevertheless, closely associated with the tree (the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil) and the serpent (Satan), a "symbolic remnant of an earlier religious [and mythic] age, [an age] before the Jews passed through the tumultuous shift from polytheism to monotheism" (Shattuck 51). In the Old Testament and in Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Eve becomes a *human/woman* sacrificial symbol in order to destroy an earlier Goddess religion. In the story of Genesis, as well as in *Paradise Lost*,

> . . . the creation of *woman* and the trouble she caused seems designed to convert those members of the Israelite nation who still held the Goddess in high regard. Archaeologists have recovered many female

> talismanic figurines from Iron Age Israel; male figures are almost nonexistent. Their presence suggests the deep entrenchment of feminine values in Israelite culture and the impediments a new religion, *based on the written word*, would have encountered in eradicating feminine influences, images, and worship. A sacred book that details how mischievous and worthless women are would be a powerful means of advancing, at women's expense, the fortunes of both the left brain *and literacy*. (Shlain 115-6; emphasis added)

In the creation myths of Genesis and *Paradise Lost*, or the written word as *the Word*, Eve *is written* without divine status in an effort to dissociate her with any previous Goddess religion. However, as Joseph Campbell points out,

> [t]he principal divinity of the people of Canaan was the Goddess, and associated with the Goddess is the serpent. This is the symbol of the mystery of life. The male-god-oriented group rejected it. In other words, there is a historical rejection of the Mother Goddess implied in the story of the Garden of Eden. (Campbell, *Power of Myth* 55)

Given Eve's "implied" association with the Mother Goddess in the story of the Garden of Eden, albeit an association by "rejection" of the Mother Goddess, it is not unreasonable to suggest that she may be genealogically related to this Goddess. If myths are, as has been suggested by May and Campbell, one glorious narrative that is beyond time, then as Thomas Mann has put it, "myth . . . is an eternal truth in contrast to an empirical truth" that "speaks to our conscious and subconscious" (qtd. in May 27). As an eternal truth "myth transcends time," which would therefore render alterable Eve's *fixed*

position as *human* in the written word of the myths of Genesis and *Paradise Lost* (27). Because Eve is so closely associated with both the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil and the Tree of Life, she may be a symbolic representation of any number of Goddess figures that flow throughout the transcendent space that is the mythic narrative. For instance, she may be mythically related to the story about the White Youth of the Yukuts of Siberia, a myth in which the youth goes over to the gigantic tree of life and

> [t]he tree began to groan, and out of its roots a female figure emerged to the waist: a woman of middle age, with earnest regard, hair flowing free, and bosom bare. The goddess offered her milk to the youth from sumptuous breast, and after partaking of it he felt his strength increase a hundredfold. At the same time the goddess promised the youth every happiness and blessed him in such a way that neither water, nor fire, iron, nor anything else should ever do him harm. (Campbell, *Hero With a a Thousand Faces* 335-6)

The Goddess associated with this tree (of life), with her "hair flowing free" and "bosom bare," resembles Eve in *Paradise Lost*, at least to some extent, in that "half her swelling breast / Naked met [Adam's] under the flowing gold / Of her loose tresses hid" (4.495-7). The resemblance between these two Feminine figures is striking. Yet in *Paradise Lost*, and in Genesis by association, the "goddess-like" Eve, as the bringer of Sin and Death into the world, is in essence seen as a *woman* who "unadorned golden tresses wore / Disheveled, but in wanton ringlets waved / As the vine curls her tendrils" (4.305-7). The "goddess-like" Eve is described as a woman disheveled and wanton, whose vine curls resemble creeping tendrils that will eventually ensnare Adam after she has succumbed to

the serpent's evil seduction. This image of Eve is the subtle artifice perpetrated by the Old Testament authors, and by the Miltonic myth, in an effort to dissociate Eve from the Mother Goddess, one of whom was the Canaanite Goddess Asherah. As Merlin Stone indicates in *When God was a Woman*, many Bible passages report that

> idols of the female deity, referred to as *asherah* (in lower case), were to be found on every high hill, under every green tree and alongside altars in the temples. They were a symbol identified with the worship of the Goddess as Asherah and may have been a pole or a living tree, perhaps carved as a statue. (175)

The Goddess Asherah, who was known as the "Creator of all Deities" (174), was depicted on ancient Canaanite plaques as carrying a serpent in each hand. This Goddess was a major symbol of the Goddess religion and the Levite priesthood, as the advocates of Yahweh (the Hebrew God), wrote the Old Testament creation story in such a way as to destroy the myth/religion of the Mother Goddess that represented the tree and who retained the serpent in an advisory, life giving capacity (217). Eve therefore becomes the *human* Levite representation of Asherah in an effort to discredit the Goddess religion; and the serpent, "as the familiar counselor" to the Goddess/Woman, is depicted "as a source of evil" and is portrayed "in such a menacing and villainous role that to listen to the prophetesses of the female deity would be to violate the religion of the male deity in a most dangerous manner" (221). As a result of this Levite depiction of *woman*, Eve becomes the bringer of Sin and Death into the world by means of her association to both the tree (as a representation of the Goddess) and the serpent (the ancient symbol of divine counsel and giver of life). As Stone points out, "[i]t can hardly have been chance or

coincidence that it was a serpent who offered Eve the advice" because "people of that time knew that the serpent was the symbol, perhaps even the instrument, of divine counsel in the religion of the Goddess" (221). Joseph Campbell indicates that "we have Sumerian seals from as early as 3500 B.C. showing the serpent and the tree and the goddess, with the goddess giving the fruit of life to a visiting male. *The old mythology of the goddess is right there*" (*Power of Myth* 54-5; emphasis added). This positive Feminine mythology of the Goddess, the tree, and the serpent ran counter to the Levite priesthood who sought to inscribe a sacred text (dominated by a male deity, the Name-of-the-Father) in which the creation myth (depicting the Goddess as human)

> blamed the female of the species for initial sexual consciousness in order to suppress the worship of the Queen of Heaven, Her sacred women and matrilineal customs, [and] from that time on assigned to women the role of sexual temptress. It cast her as the cunning and contriving arouser of the physical desires of men, she who offers the appealing but dangerous fruit. In the male religions, sexual drive was not to be regarded as the natural biological desires of women and men that encouraged the species to reproduce itself but was to be viewed as woman's fault. (Stone 222)

Clearly the Old Testament authors, as well as Milton, "succeeded," to a certain extent, in undermining the religion of the Goddess by depicting Eve both as human and as the bringer of Sin and Death into the world. But does this Old Testament idea of woman as bringer of Sin and Death into the world appear in any other mythologies? Not according to Joseph Campbell. He states that nowhere else in mythology does woman appear as *sinner*. It is only in this "'just so' story produced long ago by an obscure

Semitic people," and later embellished by John Milton, that the sociolect confronts Woman as an archival representation of *sinner* (Shattuck 50). Campbell suggests that the closest thing to this archival representation of Woman "would be perhaps Pandora with Pandora's box, but that's not sin, that's just trouble" that she brings into the world (*Power of Myth* 54). Therefore, Eve becomes the only representation of Woman in mythology that is seen (or *written as*) the bringer of Sin and Death into the world. Interestingly enough, however, Milton, in *Paradise Lost*, compares Eve with Pandora, a Greek Goddess whose name means "the gift to all" (Hamilton 70). Milton may have mistakenly equated Eve with Pandora, a Goddess not responsible for bringing Sin and Death into the world, but he nevertheless compares the two to each other. In *Paradise Lost*, Eve is described as:

> *More lovely* than *Pandora*, whom the Gods
> Endow'd with all thir gifts, and O too like
> In sad event, when to the unwiser Son
> Of *Japhet* brought by *Hermes*, she ensnar'd
> Mankind with her fair looks, to be aveng'd
> On him who had stole *Jove's* authentic fire. (4.714-19; emphasis added)

Although Eve, according to the Old Testament creation myth, is *written* without the divine status of Goddess, Milton nevertheless compares her to the Goddess Pandora. Not only does he compare her to Pandora, he seems to elevate her above this Goddess by stating that Eve is "*More lovely* than *Pandora*, whom the Gods / Endow'd with all thir gifts." This *textual elevation of Eve above* Pandora—by representing her as *more lovely*—suggests that Eve, at least in *Paradise Lost*, is not only genealogically related to

the Goddess but is also "superior" to the Goddess, or Goddesses, given the transcendent nature of the mythologic narrative. Eve must, therefore, be a representation of the Mother Goddess even though the Old Testament creation myth strives to present her as being nothing more than human. Genealogically, then, Eve *is* related to the Goddess by virtue of the fact that the Old Testament authors, and Milton, try so hard to distance her from that divine status while at the same time—whether consciously or unconsciously—closely associating her with the archetypal model of the Goddess that resides in the unconsciousness of the mythic narrative. As a result of this "divine" association Eve commands Goddess status, a status that allows the superimposition of divinity onto her by means of an *unconscious remembrance* in the mythic narrative. Moreover, Eve's similarity to Asherah, a similarity used by the Levite authors to suppress the earlier Goddess religion by making Eve human, suggests an even more immediate genealogical relationship between these two figures that argues for Eve's status as Goddess. Eve's humanness in both Genesis and *Paradise Lost* is a humanness that is a form of Being-in the mythic narrative that becomes a "*being otherwise*" due to her written, genealogical relationship to the Goddess (Levinas, *Otherwise than Being* 7). Eve's association with the Goddess in the mythic narrative allows her to become an "*otherwise than being*" that is "stated in a saying [which goes beyond *the Said* as archival discourse] that must also be *unsaid* in order to thus extract the *otherwise than being* from the Said in which it already comes to signify but a *being otherwise*" (7). Eve is, therefore, a written human *other* (for the *being otherwise*) in Genesis and *Paradise Lost* that the "'otherwise than being' passes through, thus leaving its trace" (Handelman, *Fragments of Redemption* 214) as a Being that "must be understood on the basis of *being's other* (Levinas, *Otherwise than Being*

16). The trace of the *otherwise than being* that is left in Eve is the trace of the Goddess, or *being's other*, the other history that goes unsaid in the narratives of Genesis and *Paradise Lost*, an other history (alternative knowledge) that the reader-narrator may appropriate through the unconscious remembrance in the mythic narrative. Eve, although written as a fallen Woman responsible for bringing Sin and Death into the world, is nonetheless a Goddess due to her archetypal and matrilineal kinship with the Goddess in the mythic narrative.

Adam, on the other hand, does not have any "divine" status as a god because he was made of clay/earth (*adamah*) in the male god's *image* (Neumann 135; emphasis added). The only divine status that Adam may possess resides in his *resemblance to the creator* and the biblical assertion that he was made first, not from any trace of an *otherwise than being* running through him by way of the mythic narrative. He is simply *formed* out of clay by the creator and therefore does not possess any concrete supernaturalness that may be derived from his creation. Although parallels to Adam's creation may be found in the myths of Greece, India, and China, the "*original, overlaid stratum* [in the mythic narrative] *knows* of a female creative being," a forbidden knowledge that tends to negate any divine status for Adam while at once reinforcing Eve's status as divinely ordained (135; emphasis added). Adam is, therefore, simply a hu*man*. Nevertheless, for the worshipers of Yahweh, it was of "ultimate importance that the male was made first" in the *image* of the creator, and that Eve was created "from a small rather insignificant part of man, his rib," an assurance by the male dominated religion that "the male does not come from the female, but the female from the male" (Stone 219). What better way for the male dominated religion "to discredit women's

roles in the creation of life, and by extension, the [Mother] Goddess" than by asserting that "this defect," "Crooked by nature" and "More to the part sinister" was *born of man* (Shlain 131)? In spite of the biblical and Miltonic assertions that Eve's creation was the result of a birth *from man*, the supernaturalness of this event (which the original, overlaid stratum of the mythic narrative *knows*) strongly suggests that Eve, but not Adam, genealogically possesses divine status in the mythic narrative.

Even though, as I contend, Eve is genealogically related to the Goddess, particularly Asherah, the "Creator of all Deities," she nonetheless remains, as Woman, unredeemed in the archive as the bringer of Sin and Death into the world. In *Paradise Regained* there is the suggestion of redemption for *all* by means of Christ, "the second Adam, reversing the Fall which brought death into the world, and all our woe" (Belsey 104). Additionally, Mary, Christ's mother, is interpreted in *Paradise Regained* and in *Paradise Lost* as being Milton's "Second Eve" (Hughes 197). In the case of Mary, however, there can be no redemption for Eve because the trace of the Goddess as *otherwise than being* does not run through Mary either, only the trace of a patriarchal Name-of-the-Father runs through her as the mother of the Son of God. Because Mary remains archivally *fixed* in the Name-of-the-Father she has no genealogic, or matrilineal, association with the Feminine Goddess whereby she can offer any form of redemption for Eve. As a result of this fixity Mary remains distinctly human. I would suggest, therefore, that Mary's authority as Milton's second Eve resides simply "in name only."

In the case of Christ, particularly Milton's Christ, he too cannot offer redemption for Eve, the *unsaid* genealogic representative in the archive of the Mother Goddess, because archivally his "is the story of '*man's* first disobedience', which is the source of

'*all* our woe', and its project is 'to justify the ways of God' *in general* '*to men*' *in general*" (Belsey 95; emphasis added). Although the "choice Christ makes" as the Son of God "repairs the damage" of Adam and Eve's fall and "regains salvation" (100-1), it does so only patriarchally by means of the "explicit elimination of Eve" in the New Testament and *Paradise Regained* as a *subject* (endowed with any positive form of subjectivity) in these archival texts (96). This patriarchally explicit elimination of Eve, an elimination that does not allow her redemption, may be due to the fact that "Jesus favored Genesis' [northern, Ephraimitic] 'E' version over the [southern, Juedean] 'J' one. He refers to Adam and Eve only once; Eve's transgression, *never*" (Shlain 216; emphasis added). By his "silence" on the matter of Eve's "transgression," Jesus seems not to include Eve in the offer of redemption in the male religion and further commits the unsaid language of the Goddess to *silence*. The Feminine presence-in-absence of the Goddess as Woman in the archive, and especially in the Miltonic command, thus remains "responsible for *man's* mortality and fall from grace" (Figes 42).

Although there have been literary-critical attempts among some feminist scholars to redeem Milton's reputation as a patriarchal author, "[n]o feminist in her [or his] senses would try to find anything cheerful to say about Milton's *myth of male oppression divinely ordained*" (Belsey 59; emphasis added). Milton's "theology" that is conveyed in *Paradise Lost* as a "new scripture" in the archive and, as a result, in the sociolect, forces Eve to remain unredeemed as the bringer of Sin and Death into the world. The archive and, therefore, the sociolect both retain a Miltonic, patriarchal theology in which Eve remains unredeemed. As a theology, then, Milton's command "would belong to the realm of the 'said' [the archive], which always betrays and dissimulates the saying," or

the unsaid (silenced) narrative of the Goddess in archival discourse (Handelman, *Fragments of Redemption* 235). As a result of this betrayal in the Said,

> . . . theological language destroys the religious situation of transcendence. The infinite 'presents' itself anarchically, but thematization loses the anarchy which alone can accredit it. *Language about God rings false* or *becomes a myth*, that is, *can never be taken literally*. (Levinas, *Otherwise than Being* 197n25; emphasis added)

Thus the infinite, or the Saying,

> is a *preoriginal* orientation, approach, *nearness without abolishing distance between terms*, and the relation of responsibility. This orientation . . . [is taken] to be the very ability of anything to signify, to give itself, to be not only itself *but other—for something else*. Despite violent appropriations of the 'said' by systems, themes, the state, prisons, or asylums [the archive] there are . . . forces within language which can interrupt this violence. (Handelman, *Fragments of Redemption* 235; emphasis added).

Eve, as a result of the Said in the Miltonic command, remains unredeemed because his theological language in *Paradise Lost* further distances her from the transcendence of the unsaid language of the Goddess in the mythic narrative. The poem "notoriously proclaims its own patriarchal reading of the almighty Word" in the male religion and "repeatedly" (Belsey 59) distances Eve from divinity by having her admit to Adam:

> My Author and Disposer, what thou bidd'st

Unargu'd I obey; so God ordains,

God is thy Law, thou mine: *to know no more*

Is woman's happiest knowledge and her praise.

With thee conversing *I forget all time*,

All seasons and thir change, all please alike. (4.635-40; emphasis added)

Eve is commanded by Milton, the *Other that knows*, to "know no more," which is "*woman's* happiest knowledge." She is also commanded to "forget all time," a command that attempts to completely distance her from mythic time, the time in which the Goddess resides as a forbidden knowledge in the original, overlaid stratum *that knows* in the mythic narrative. Additionally, Milton commands that:

Not equal, as thir sex not equal seem'd;

For contemplation hee and valor form'd,

For softness shee and sweet attractive Grace,

Hee for God only, shee for God in him. (4.296-9; emphasis added)

Because she is for God *in* Adam, Eve is positioned further away from divinity by placing *man*, with "Absolute rule" over her, between herself and God (4.301). The archival/theological language in *Paradise Lost* succeeds, at least in the Said, to destroy any ties to the Goddess that Eve might have by distancing her as far away from divinity as possible. She is commanded to "know no more," to "forget all time," and to obey man (who is elevated above her) as a barrier to divinity. The male dominated religion, as represented in the archive by *Paradise Lost*, appears to have successfully obliterated the trace of the Mother Goddess in Eve, specifically the Goddess Asherah, leaving her both

unredeemed and appearing nothing more than human. However, can there be redemption for Eve and by what means can she be redeemed, if any?

Because Eve is the likely archetypal representative of Asherah, the Mother of all Deities that the Levite authors used to destroy the Goddess religion and implement a male dominated religion, her archetypal status genealogically places her in the mythic narrative as a primal trace of the Goddess in the unconsciousness that is myth. She is related to the "preoriginal," overlaid stratum *that knows* in the Saying that goes unsaid in the mythic narrative, which announces a nearness to the Goddess without abolishing the distance or trace that exists between them. The Saying, in which the silenced language of the Goddess resides, is "a realm of equivocation in language, the relation to the other prior to thematization, representation, comprehension, and narrative," in other words, the Said that is the archive (Handelman, *Fragments of Redemption* 248). In this equivocal space of the Saying there is "the ultimate relation to the interlocutor outside the discourse that narrates it," the interlocutor that is outside and prior to *the Word* that is Milton's command in the archive (248). The interlocutor in the Saying that is the silenced, unsaid language of the Goddess is the Goddess herself, the Goddess who is the preoriginal female creative being antecedent to Being as an *otherwise than being*. The Goddess, as *otherwise than being* in the Saying and antecedent to *the Word*, is the interlocutor who "disrupts" in the unconsciousness of language "the drive toward conclusive certainties, identities, and representations of the 'said'" (248). The Goddess, then, is one of the forces in the unconsciousness of language that is the mythic narrative who can disrupt the violence that has been done to Eve in the Said, or the Miltonic command. As the interlocutor outside the discourse that narrates her in the Said, the Goddess offers a

Saying that is an "unsaying" of the "inevitable and incessant dissimulation and betrayal of the saying into the said" and, as a result, her "unsaying opens to exteriority, to the transcendence of the other" (249). The exteriority that opens to the transcendence of the other is the alterity in the unsaid language of the Goddess in which she resides, an alterity in language that renders the language about God to ring false and not to be taken literally. By causing God's language to be false, the preoriginal Goddess in alterity, whose trace resides in Eve, renders Milton's command to ring false and opens it up to an *unsaying*. The unsaying that the Goddess offers in the alterity of the mythic narrative is redemption for Eve in the "for something else" that is the essence that "has its time and hour" in being's other (Levinas, *Otherwise than Being* 46).

Because the "for something else" of redemption offered to Eve by the Goddess has *its time and hour*, there is the question of what time and hour Eve acquires redemption from the Goddess in the unsaying? Moreover, which Goddess successfully secures Eve's redemption and in what time and hour does her redemption occur? Clearly, at least when taken at face value, any Goddess prior to Eve *may* not offer her a preexisting redemption given both their anterior existence to her and their nearly successful "elimination" in the archive, an elimination that also includes Eve as Goddess. Redemption for Eve will have to be granted by a Goddess that "comes into existence" after her, one that genealogically has her own time and hour in the mythic narrative. Because Eve's condemnation exists in the archive, and has been "fixed" over and above the Bible in the sociolect by the Miltonic command, her redemption will have to come by way of the unconsciousness in the mythic narrative and, therefore, in mythic time. Eve's redemption will have to be accomplished through the intertext or, to be more precise, the

unconsciousness of the intertext in order to acquire the unconscious, mythic narrative in which it must be offered (Riffaterre, *Fictional Truth* 86). But which "modern" Goddess in the mythic narrative has the power to grant Eve redemption by way of the unconsciousness of the intertext?

Since the intertext involves the "analogon *or reverse face of the text* and thus a text or series of texts selected as referents by the text [or texts] we are reading," it is generally described as being concentrically connected rather than running from text to text along a linear line (86; emphasis added). This concentric connection along the intertext involves the rippling outward from a primary discourse that marks a common center, in this case *Paradise Lost*, whereby a multiplicity of discourses—including those past and present—inform its "meaning." As a common center, then, *Paradise Lost* is concentrically informed by the Bible, mythology, theology, philosophy, astronomy, and so on, all of which are discourses that Milton uses to inform his poem's "meaning." Alternately, *Paradise Lost* concentrically informs the "meaning" of future discourses such as Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa*, Laurence Stern's *Tristram Shandy*, William Blake's *Milton*, and Gustav Flaubert's *Madam Bovary* to name a few. Each discourse informs the other by means of the intertext and as readers "progress through one or more [of these discourses], they come to realize that apparently unconnected and diverse representations or stories have relational features in common that direct interpretation *beyond what each instance authorizes*" (86; emphasis added). However, the intertext is, in essence, "hidden like the psychological unconscious and, like the unconscious, it is hidden in such a way that we cannot help finding it" (86). It is through the unconsciousness of the intertext that we, as

readers, "cannot help finding" the other history that goes beyond what Milton authorizes in *Paradise Lost* as archival discourse. Somewhere in the unconsciousness of the intertext the mythic narrative must be appropriated by a "modern" Goddess in a specific time and hour whereby she can effectively and permanently grant Eve redemption, thus subverting both the Miltonic command and the archive. While at least one scholar has suggested that it is Richardson's Clarissa who intertextually redeems Eve, I would like to suggest that the true intertextual time and hour of the Goddess arrives in Thomas Hardy's *Tess of the D'Ubervilles*. It is in the time and hour of Hardy's Tess, "a [G]oddess figure of *immense stature*," when Eve is ultimately, and permanently, granted redemption and the Miltonic command is rendered merely a (sub)version in the unsaid language of the Goddess (Stave 101; emphasis added).

Since, as I have suggested, it is Tess who redeems Eve by way of the intertext, the remaining chapters in this analysis will demonstrate how this redemption is effected. To arrive at the time and hour of Tess's redemption of Eve involves several complex processes through which the reader must pass in order to realize the authenticity of Eve's redemption. In chapter three an analysis of Hardy's *Tess of the D'Ubervilles* will be conducted in which Tess will be examined as a possible fallen Goddess herself. This chapter will also examine the nature of the-trace-of-the-Goddess as Other wherein Tess sacrifices herself to mythic time and, as a result, appropriates both the intertext and the mythic narrative containing the unsaid language of the Goddess. In chapter four retroactivity and the theoretical essence of the Supernatural narrator will be dealt with, and it will be in this chapter that Tess's successful redemption of Eve will be established. Chapter five will deal with time and the Other, a time and essence in which Tess, as an

otherwise than being, gains relative control of mythic time. Redemption and the Other will also be examined wherein I will demonstrate how the *otherwise than being* effects a (sub)version of the Miltonic myth/command by her successful redemption of Eve and, as a result, achieves a Saying in the Said through the unsaid language of the Goddess. All of these analyses will of course be subject to continued examinations and interpretations of both *Paradise Lost* and *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*. However, in the following chapter I will deal with the nature of concentric, archival discourse and how, according to Lacanian psychoanalytic theory, it spirals into a narrative concentricity that opens up a space of alterity, or "nonsite," as an "opening up" to "an exposure to the *outside*—to the other" (Handelman, *Fragments of Redemption* 296).

CHAPTER 2

INTERTEXTUAL UNCONSCIOUSNESS: CONCENTRIC, ARCHIVAL DISCOURSE INCESSANTLY SLIDES INTO NARRATIVE CONCENTRICITY

The intertext, whether it is fiction, the mythic narrative, the archive, or whatever discourse, "acts as the unconscious of [discourse] and . . . readers recover or discover that intertext because the narrative itself contains clues leading back to it" (Riffaterre, *Fictional Truth* 91). Although the term "leading back to it" suggests a linear quality to the intertext, it is perhaps more precise to suggest that the intertext exhibits a concentric quality because "all language" is "understood to be concentric" (Belsey 36). In Geraldine Heng's essay "Feminine Knots and the Other *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*," she describes concentric discourse as various narratives in a single text—or among multiple texts—that ripple outward from a primary discourse that marks a common center (500). Therefore, according to Heng, the denotation of multiple narratives in a discourse or the intertext would simply loop outward, one on top of the other, forming a system of "ripples" stemming from a central narrative axis such as *Paradise Lost*. However, the theory that all language and, as a consequence, all discourse in the intertext is understood to be concentric tends to be reductive in that it does not allow for the overlap of "meaning" in language that is represented by a multiplicity of symbolic orders. The intertext, which possesses language as its primary source, is made up of differing symbolic orders (because of the unconsciousness of language) and these symbolic orders tend to extend outward from a "central axis" and *into each other* by means of an

overlapping contingency. Because of this extension from one symbolic order *into* another the concept that language must be understood as concentric is a bit misleading. In some respects the intertext may be said to be concentric; however, because of its dependence on language the intertext is thoroughly infused with a multiplicity of symbolic orders that carry with them unconscious meanings that render any *one* "meaning" indeteriminate. This overlapping of symbolic orders in both a single narrative and in the intertext is what I have termed concentricity. However, what is concentricity and how does it relate to *Paradise Lost* and Eve's eventual redemption by the "modern" intertextual Goddess, Tess?

Concentricity is not concentric as generally defined in the dictionary wherein various narratives ripple outward in ever widening circles (that do not overlap) from a primary discourse acting as a common center. Although in concentricity narratives, as symbolic orders, do become circular (or concentric), they do not conveniently ripple outward in the form of one larger ring on top of another. As symbolic orders in the unconsciousness of language narratives are subject to the "incessant sliding" of language as "*interconnecting* pathways [by] . . . which any point in the topography of the signified *may be reached by more than one route*" (Boothby 121-2; emphasis added). This theory of concentricity is one in which occurs the constituent overlap of symbolic orders, whether interior or exterior to the subject, and represents a "symbolic" configuration that delineates a topography wherein a variety of supplementary "orders" are represented as they radiate *outward* from the subject both (un)consciously and in narrative, linguistic, and cultural terms. The symbolic order as applied to concentricity *is* the Lacanian symbolic order by which the subject attains language and "linguistically mediated

cognitions" (18). According to Richard Boothby, Lacan's psychoanalytic theorization of the symbolic order comprises a "complex system of signifying elements whose meaning is determined by their relation to the other elements of the system—a grand structure . . . in which meaning is free to *circulate among associated elements or signifiers*" (18; emphasis added). The key word in the above phrase is "circulate" whereby meaning may become circular and thus circulate in and among *overlapping* elements or signifiers in concentricity.

These associated elements or signifiers lend credence to the concept that although the Lacanian symbolic order essentially refers to the attainment of language by way of the unconscious, it can also refer to exterior and constituent elements or signifiers (i.e., symbolic orders) that may be attained culturally through mythology and thus applied to the narrative process. This attainment of language applies to Milton's writings, particularly *Paradise Lost*, in that "[i]f it is true that man finds the proper abode of his existence in language—whether he is aware of it or not—then an experience we undergo with language will touch the innermost nexus of our existence" (Heidegger, *On the Way to Language* 57). As "the innermost nexus" or "inner world" of "*our* existence," the "process of imagination" that constitutes *Paradise Lost* may be the textual "internalization" of Milton's psychological expansion of the unconscious through language (Waldoff 102). In this way, *Paradise Lost*, which resembles the unconscious in its incessantly sliding significations by way of the intertext, may represent the abode of the Goddess's existence *in which* she traverses a succession of symbolic orders that slide into the alterity of narrative concentricity. An alterity that is a nonsite opening up to an

exposure to the outside where the Saying of the Goddess may be heard, or read, in the unsaying of the Said that is the Miltonic command.

In this theory of concentricity, then, the topology of overlapping circles that make up the various (sliding) symbolic orders of the intertext opens up a gap in its unconsciousness—by virtue of the interconnectivity in concentricity—which involves a space of alterity wherein the Goddess may be read/heard as (an)Other trace-of-Being-in-the-text. As a result of this access to the space of alterity in narrative concentricity the Goddess becomes the Other, the *Other that knows* the other history to *Paradise Lost* as a trace-of-Being-in-the-text, an "otherness" that "introduces [a] determination" *into* the reader and the text that "puts a system into circulation" as narrative concentricity (Derrida, *Dissemination* 163). This circulation in otherness, or alterity, *is* concentricity wherein the reader-narrator, by virtue of his or her interpretation of a given discourse with its unconscious and incessantly sliding symbolic orders, also becomes the *Other that knows* in the text. Because the author/poet, as Other or text, is also the *Other that knows*, the reader as interpreter of the text (or reader-narrator) also becomes the *Other that knows* by realizing the author's various (sliding) symbolic orders in the alterity that opens up the reader-narrator's virtual dimension of the text, or the coming together of the text and the imagination in the "unconscious dimension of the imagination" (Waldoff 5-6). In this way, then, the reader-narrator as *an(O)ther that knows*, can successfully break down—whether consciously or unconsciously, based on archetypal representations in the mythic, collective unconscious—the distinction between the subject and object, or the Self and Other in the alterity of narrative concentricity that is the intertext. Therefore, the essence of what constitutes the *Other that knows* in *Paradise Lost* slides into the unconsciousness

of the reader-narrator, which may be the unconsciousness of the Goddess in alterity striving to break down the distinctions between the Self and Other *and* the poet whose presence-in-absence in the poem represents a trace-of-Being-in-the-text as *the Word*. This concept of concentricity *in*volving a trace-of-Being-in-the-text embraces, yet reconfigures, the philosophies of Being as conceived by Jacques Derrida's "trace," Jacques Lacan's "'being' in language," Martin Heidegger's "Being-in," and Emmanuel Levinas's "otherwise than being." All of which readily fold together into a trace-of-Being-in-the-text that constitutes the Goddess as Other, the *Other that knows*, in the mythic narrative. By drawing on the Heideggerian formulation of "Being-in," concentricity locates the Other as a potential Being-in-the-text by following the dialogic:

> Even if it were feasible to give an ontological definition of "Being-in" primarily in terms of Being-in-the-world which *knows*, it would still be our first task to show that knowing has the phenomenal character of a Being which is *in and towards the world*. If one reflects upon this relationship of Being, an entity called "Nature" is given proximally as that which becomes known. Knowing, as such, is not to be met in this entity. If knowing "is" at all, it belongs solely to those entities which know. But even in those entities, human-Things, knowing is not present-at-hand. In any case, it is not externally ascertainable as, let us say, bodily properties are. Now, inasmuch as knowing belongs to these entities and is not some external characteristic, it must be "inside." (Heidegger, *Being and Time* 87; emphasis added)

Although not an "external characteristic" in a tangible sense, the Goddess, as the *Other that knows* in the mythic narrative, occupies a space in alterity that represents exteriority (as a nonsite) and an exposure to the outside that is the other history unsaid in *Paradise Lost*. Following the above Heideggerian dialogic, then, the Being *that knows* is the Other that "is in and towards" the text, and that which is known is the knowledge appropriated from the "'being' in language as text, a "nonbeing" that is the "unconscious subject" of "truth" (Ragland-Sullivan 52). Because of this dialogic the theorization can be made that that which is to be known is both "inside" the text and "inside" the Goddess as Other, a Being-in-the-text that the reader now cohabits as the other, or reader-narrator and, as a result, (an)Other knowing subject. Consequently,

> . . . only then can the problem arise of how this knowing subject comes out of its inner "sphere" into one which is "other and external," of how knowing can have any object at all, and of how one must think of the object itself so that eventually the subject knows it without needing to venture a leap into another sphere [of immanence]. (Heidegger, *Being and Time* 87)

But,

> when one asks for the positive signification of this "outside" of immanence in which knowing is proximally enclosed, or when one inquires how this "Being inside" ("*Immenseins*") which knowing possesses has its own character of Being grounded in the kind of Being which belongs to the subject, then silence reigns. And no matter how this inner sphere may get interpreted, if one does no more than ask how

> knowing makes its way "out of" it and achieves "transcendence," it becomes evident that the knowing which presents such enigmas will remain problematical unless one has previously clarified how it is and what it is. (87)

The "how it is and what it is" of knowing in "transcendence" is the Other that develops in a text by way of the incessantly sliding symbolic orders in language, thereby producing, through the reader-narrator, a "knowing" Being-in-the-text (the Goddess) that "is not present-at-hand" but present-in-immanence. Moreover, as Ellie Ragland-Sullivan points out in *Jacques Lacan and the Philosophy of Psychoanalysis*,

> . . . the Other(A) [*sic*] refers to the Symbolic order . . . , i.e., the secondary unconscious created by subjugation to the social order of symbols, rules, and language. In a broader sense the Other(A) infers *familial prehistory*, as well as the *social order of language*, *myths*, and conventions. [Stuart] Schneiderman has written: "The Other can be considered to be the space of community, a space which man will make over, organize, and impress his stamp upon, to make himself the cause of his unnatural existence." Elsewhere he has observed: "Otherness is always and irreducibly outside the subject; it is fundamentally alien to him. Insofar as the discourse of the Other agitates a singular subject, it forms the Freudian unconscious." Essentially, then, the Other(A) is a concept of continuity between consciousness and unconsciousness, between identifications and language. (16; emphasis added)

This concept of the Other corresponds to the Otherness in concentricity that is alterity in that what is written by the author involves a multiplicity of symbolic orders, a multiplicity of symbolic orders that produces a "speaking and knowing being who *in* the [text] writes *on* the [text]. This movement through which the [text], *articulated* by the *voice* of the [poet], is folded and bound to itself, the movement through which the [poem] becomes a subject in itself and for itself. . ." (Derrida, *Writing and Difference* 65). The poem, then, or in this case *Paradise Lost*, becomes "infinitely self-reflective, its own subject and its own representation" (Handelman, *Slayers of Moses* 175) in what is Said and unsaid, a self-consciousness of the text immanent in the Other as self-reflective of both presence-in-absence in the written and unwritten of the text (Derrida, *Of Grammatology* 102). The presence-in-absence of Otherness in narrative concentricity is "outside the subject," and is a discourse of (dis)continuity "between consciousness and unconsciousness" that tends to further break down the Miltonic/archival distinctions between subject and object, the Self and Other. Additionally, the presence-in-absence in the written and the unwritten that make up narrative concentricity in the intertext involves "the sign of the absent other," the Goddess (the object of desire [a *libido sciendi*]) that becomes the "constituent factor of memory" in the trace (Handelman, *Slayers of Moses* 166). The Goddess becomes an unconscious remembrance that the reader-narrator appropriates because the "mechanism of consciousness is 'deferral'" and Milton's "In the beginning" becomes a "postponement, not presence" (166). The Said in *Paradise Lost* is clearly the archival presence in what is written by Milton as *the Word*, but the unsaid, or the Saying, is the absence of what is unwritten in *Paradise Lost* by virtue of the

irreducible alterity of the Other as Goddess in the reader-narrator's unconscious dimension of the imagination.

It is safe to say, then, that, as the *Other that knows* in *Paradise Lost*, Milton's unconscious dimension of imagination as narrator and text involves the unsaid because Milton is writing an exposition of his imagination and, thus, enriching it in presence-in-absence by both putting in and leaving out particular references to the mythic narrative. This poetic contradiction as regards presence-in-absence in language is tied to the Lacanian theorization that the "subject is split into conscious and unconscious parts" (Ragland-Sullivan 2). This split, or *Ichspaltung*, constitutes in the narrative what Lacan describes as the *moi* and the *je*, which correspond to the narrated "I" (the spoken or written Self) and the narrating "I" (the speaking or writing Self), respectively. In essence, the *moi* corresponds to the spoken Self or text, such as *Paradise Lost*, and the *je* corresponds to the speaking Self that is the poet who is setting down a written exposition of the imagination. Therefore, according to Lacan's "epistemology," Milton's poetic *moi* "ensures that there is always more in language (an insistence, or intentional pressure) than what is being said. The *moi* makes *any form* of discourse as overdetermined as does the dream or neurotic symptom" (48; emphasis added). Moreover, the *je*, the narrating "I" as poet, "is an object of the Other's [or poem's] discourse" and, "[c]oextensive with language, yet desiring from within, the *je* mistakenly thinks it can represent its own totality by designating itself in a statement" (47). In this way, Milton's *moi* text as *Paradise Lost* unconsciously possesses the *otherwise than being* (the Goddess) that is *a trace-of-Being-in-the-text* and "is stated in a saying that must also be unsaid" by the *moi*

"in order to thus extract the *otherwise than being* from the Said [the archive] in which it already comes to signify but a *being otherwise*" (Levinas, *Otherwise than Being* 7).

Due to the necessity that Milton's *moi* makes any form of discourse both before and after *Paradise Lost* extremely overdetermined in meaning by way of the intertext, thus disallowing his poetic *moi* the occasion to represent its own totality by designating itself as a statement, the trace-of-Being-in-the-text that the reader-narrator attempts to attain becomes *otherwise than being*. This *otherwise than being*, which is both being and non-being in the text, inhabits the "saying [in the unsaid] which states it" (the archival *moi*) that is produced by the *je* in the Said (7). As an *otherwise than being* the Goddess is a trace-of-Being-in-the-text that comes to inhabit a space of alterity in concentricity that is the space opened up in the topology of the overlapping "rings" in the various and incessantly sliding symbolic orders that make up the archive. This alterity, or gap, inhabited by the *otherwise than being* in the various symbolic orders of the archive suggests that any Being-in-the-text that the reader-narrator seeks to attain is merely a "trace" of being in language, a trace that is in constant "play" within the "*difference*" (differing/deferring) of the archive and its incessantly sliding symbolic orders (Derrida, *Of Grammatology* 61, 7, 23). The trace-of-Being-in-the-text that is inscribed in Milton's *Paradise Lost* as the discourse of the Other is, in essence, the Goddess that is both present and absent, a presence-in-absence that "*does not equal nonexistence*" (Handelman, *Slayers of Moses* 172). As presence-in-absence the Goddess also occupies the reader as well as the poet in that, as a trace, she is "the sign of the absent other" (166) "and the 'other' here is also the reader" (Felman 125). Since the trace-of-Being-in-the-text occupies both the reader and the poet,

> [t]he reader-narrator is . . . that "other," [and] his [or her] personal history [Milton's, and now the reader's] [becomes] the "other history," and [*Paradise Lost*] is significant [only] to the extent that it interferes with the [unsaid] tale it tells. Each one of [the various symbolic orders in concentricity], each act of narration and each narrative, is here a *reading in the other*; each reading is a *story in the other*, [a narrative involving the intertext] whose signification is interfered with but whose interference means. And this, of course, brings us back to the unconscious, for what, indeed, is the unconscious if not—in every sense of the word—*a reader*? "In analytic discourse," writes Lacan, "the unconscious subject is presumed to be able to read. And that's what the whole affair of the unconscious amounts to." The story of the unconscious thus resembles [the intertext], insofar as they both come to us, constitutevly, *through the reader*. (125)

If the unconscious, as Other, resembles the intertext, and both the unconscious and the intertext come to "us" through the reader, then *each act of narration and each narrative* as a reading in the other and a story in the other is a trace-of-Being-in-the-text that involves the reader-narrator in the space of alterity of concentricity that the Goddess inhabits. As a result, Milton, as both author-poet and a reader of his own text, experiences with the reader of *Paradise Lost* the alterity in the experiencing of the various sliding symbolic orders as a trace-of-Being-in-the-text. Both the reader and Milton *know*, as the *Other that knows* in the poem, that the narrating "I" (*je*) is constructing an overdeterminative poetics that the narrated "I" (*moi*) is *incapable of*

totalizing in the sliding symbolic orders of the poem and, as a result, the intertext by designating itself as a genuine statement of presence. Milton's *Paradise Lost*, then, is always already inhabited by a trace-of-Being-in-the-text whose presence-in-absence produces the "multiple reverberations of meaning generated within the [concentricity of] symbolic system[s] as a whole" (Boothby 126). In this reading process, therefore, the reader becomes "aware" (through the unconsciousness of the mythic narrative) of the Goddess's presence-in-absence in the poem and in the intertext, both of which "[function] to realize an order of being" in them "that did not exist before" (127). This order of being is the trace-of-Being-in-the-text that both the reader-narrator and the Goddess inhabit in the space of alterity in narrative concentricity. By this process of attainment through narrative concentricity the Goddess exists in a space of alterity *for* the reader-narrator, and the reader-narrator attains a sense of the Goddess by means of the unconsciousness that runs through the mythic narrative. However, as has been stated, Milton's *Paradise Lost* is, "[a]t its heart," an *attempted* master-narrative (attempted because of the presence of alterity in concentricity) that seeks to obliterate the presence of the Goddess by fixing in the archive

> . . . the Logos, *the ways of God*, which in turn legitimate certain ways of men and women—and exclude others. In this sense all signifying practice—all language and all culture—is understood to be *concentric*, *to centre on a single truth*, to utter and reiterate the transcendental signified. Thus heterogeneous allusions—to the Bible, classical myth, patristic literature, English poetry and even the researches of Galileo—are assembled to tell what is in the end one story. (Belsey 36; emphasis

added)

Milton's *Paradise Lost* is concentric (in the sense of being logocentric) because, as an *attempted* master-narrative, it seeks to fix in the archive a single truth that excludes any presence of the other history in which the Goddess resides. In *Paradise Lost* Milton sought to present a narrative that would resemble the concentric spheres of the Ptolemaic universe with the earth as its center, a creation of God who presides over all as the Logos (Hughes 187). The infinitely recurring pattern in the poem is the circle

> because it is a repeating pattern, turning endlessly upon itself, and because it is the traditional symbol of divine perfection, unity, eternity, infinity. By building the poem in repeated circles, circles created by a variety of poetic devices, Milton imitated the form of the world envisioned by his inspired narrator. (Ferry 150)

Although Ferry identifies Urania as Milton's inspired narrator, which she calls an organic poetic device, it is Milton who is the inspired narrator because of his own indwelling power as the creator of *Paradise Lost*. As the creator of the poem Milton assumes a position next to God and creates a concentric narrative. Milton's creation is bracketed first by a "vast inclusion of Heaven and Hell," then narrows to Eden as the center of the universe in Book VIII, and "widens again to include Heaven, Hell, the past before the world was made and future to the end of time, in imitation of the universe circling" the Logos (151). The supporting structure of Milton's concentric Logos occurs in a passage in Book VII, which is "exactly in the middle of the poem" (151) and "[reiterates] the pattern of the circle" in the poem's concentric design (150). Milton invokes his "divinely

inspired narrator" Urania (whom I have identified as Milton himself, *the true God* of *Paradise Lost*) and takes flight to illustrate his narrative's concentric structure, singing:

> Up led by thee
> Into the Heav'n of Heav'ns I have presum'd,
> An Earthly Guest, and drawn Empyreal Air,
> Thy temp'ring; with like safety guided down
> Return me to my Native Element:
> Lest from this flying Steed unrein'd, (as once
> *Bellerophon*, though from a lower Clime)
> Dismounted, on th' *Aleian* Field I fall
> Erroneous there to wander and forlorn.
> *Half yet remains unsung*, but narrower bound
> Within the visible Diurnal Sphere;
> *Standing on Earth*, not rapt above the Pole,
> More safe I Sing with mortal voice, unchang'd
> To hoarse or mute, though fall'n on evil days,
> On evil days though fall'n, and evil tongues;
> In darkness, and with dangers *compast round*,
> An solitude; yet not alone, while thou
> Visit'st my slumbers Nightly, or when Morn
> Purples the East. . . . (12-30; emphasis added)

The reader-narrator stands "on Earth," the center of the concentric universe, with half the poem remaining "unsung." The exact center of Milton's concentric structure

wherein even the poet-God is "compast round" by his own poetic design. The poem then proceeds outward again in its concentric structure to sing the remaining books. Although the overall structure of the poem is concentric, the narratives within the attempted master-narrative are also concentric in design. When the reader-narrator reaches the Fall in Book IX, he or she finds that Adam and Eve are the center of both the poem's "Ptolemaic physical order and of its divinely ordained moral [and narrative] order" (Ferry 161). Prior to the Fall Eve depends upon Adam "as the center of her world," a world in which she is partriarchally once removed from God (161). Adam is the center of Eve's world and God is the center of Adam's. As a result of this patriarchally concentric design, even Eve's language "revolves in circles around Adam" (161) as her archetypal love poem in Book IV illustrates:

> With thee conversing I forget all time,
> All seasons and thir change, all please alike.
> Sweet is the breath of morn, her rising sweet,
> With charm of earliest Birds; pleasant the Sun
> When first on this delightful Land he spreads
> His orient Beams, on herb, tree, fruit, and flow'r,
> Glist'ring with dew; fragrant the fertile earth
> After soft showers; and sweet the coming on
> Of grateful Ev'ning mild, then silent Night
> With this her solemn Bird and this fair Moon,
> And these the Gems of Heav'n, her starry train:
> But neither breath of Morn when she ascends

With charm of earliest Birds, nor rising Sun
On this delightful land, nor herb, fruit, flow'r,
Glist'ring with dew, nor fragrance after showers,
Nor grateful Ev'ning mild, nor silent Night
With this her solemn Bird, nor walk by Moon
Or glittering Star-light without thee is sweet. (639-56)

Eve's poem begins and ends with "thee," thus revolving around Adam in an "unbroken circle" (Ferry 162). The poem contains "repetition upon repetition" wherein the "last seven lines repeat in reverse and in the negative the first eleven lines" (162). A concentric, Miltonic narrative in which Eve sings the praises of Adam's central position in *their* relationship. However, after the Fall, or to be more precise after Eve eats from the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, Eve's language "places herself *in the center of her world*" (164; emphasis added). Adam is no longer the center of Eve's world and her language turns to the use of "I" rather than "thee." Although many critics, Anne Ferry among them, tend to assume the *human* nature of Eve and deny any possibility of her possessing divine status as a Goddess, Eve becomes a form of deep, substructural narrator in *Paradise Lost* in which she asserts her *je* Self and narrates a *moi* text. Granted, each character in the poem may be said to be a substructural narrator, but Eve's status as archivally non-divine makes her subnarrative particularly important to the mythic narrative that exists in the intertext. Eve's use of "I" in Book IX, particularly after she eats the forbidden fruit, creates a *disorder* in the innermost circle of Milton's concentric poetic structure (164). While Milton clearly allows Eve this break from the divinely ordained moral order of archivally concentric discourse in order to illustrate the

destruction of unity after the Fall, he nonetheless allows Eve to enter a space of alterity in the incessantly sliding symbolic orders of *Paradise Lost* whereby her *moi* narrative touches the mythic narrative in the intertext. In Book IX, for example, after Eve eats of the fruit, she says:

> But to *Adam* in what sort
> *Shall I appear*? shall I to him make known
> As yet my change, and give him to partake
> Full happiness with mee, or rather not.
> *But keep the odds of Knowledge in my power*
> *Without Copartner*? *so to add what wants*
> *In Female Sex*, the more to draw his Love,
> And render me more equal, and perhaps,
> A thing not undesirable, sometime
> Superior: for inferior who is free?
> This may be well: but what if God have seen,
> And Death ensue? Then I shall be no more,
> And *Adam* wedded to another *Eve*,
> Shall live with her enjoying, I extinct;
> A death to think. *Confirm'd then I resolve*,
> *Adam* shall *share with me in bliss or woe*:
> So dear I love him, that with him all deaths
> I could endure, without him live no life. (816-33; emphasis added)

By her use of "I" in this speech Eve narrates a *je* Self in which she constructs a narrated *moi* text, an overdetermined text within a text (*Paradise Lost*) that *ensures there is always more than what is being said*. In essence, Eve herself becomes a trace-of-Being-in-the-text because her *moi* text traverses a succession of symbolic orders that slide into the alterity of narrative concentricity. Although the "Knowledge" gained by Eve as Milton's creation is the forbidden knowledge of archival discourse, because she creates a *moi* text in alterity where the trace-of-Being-in-the-text exists she touches on the mythic narrative in narrative concentricity that the reader-narrator cohabits with her. Eve therefore has a "Copartner" *in* the reader-narrator who brings to the text the intertext and the other history that remains unsaid in Eve's Saying. It is quite true that Eve states, "Confirm'd then I resolve, / *Adam* shall share with me in bliss or woe," a statement that reaffirms the Miltonic command of Woman's position as bringer of Sin and Death into the world. But inherent in the "I" that generates Eve's *moi* text in *Paradise Lost* is the unconscious dimension of the text (or alterity) through which the topography of the signified may be reached by more than one route. Since Eve's *moi* text is overdetermined and slides into the alterity of narrative concentricity with the reader-narrator, she not only touches the Goddess by way of the mythic narrative she *becomes* a trace-of-the-Goddess-in-the-text in the otherness that is the *otherwise than being*. As a trace-of-the-Goddess-in-the-text Eve's essence touches the Mother Goddess (through the reader-narrator) that has been separated from her and she inhabits the space of the Goddess as Goddess. This standing as a trace-of-the-Goddess-in-the-text narratively allows Eve to become *an*(*O*)*ther that knows* in the poem, and what she knows is the forbidden knowledge of the other history to *Paradise Lost* that exists in the mythic narrative. The reader-narrator,

Eve's copartner, who is also *an*(*O*)*ther that knows* in the unconscious dimension of the text, is able to break down, through Eve's *moi* text, the archetypal representations in the collective unconsciousness of the mythic narrative in order to perceive Eve's identity as an Other, an *Other that knows* the trace of the Goddess. The trace of the Goddess that both the reader-narrator and Eve obtain through the alterity of narrative concentricity is the nonbeing in the *otherwise than being* that is the unconscious subject of "truth." This realization is a *remembrance* in the trace that the reader-narrator and the Other appropriate and identify as the Goddess in Eve. Eve unconsciously possesses the *otherwise than being* that is the trace-of-the-Goddess-in-the-text, and her knowledge of that remembrance is stated in a Saying that must also be unsaid by the *je* Self through the *moi* text in order to extract it from the Said that is the Miltonic command. By going back through remembrance, both the reader-narrator and Eve (the *moi* Eve) move toward the future because with remembrance comes redemption (Handelman, *Fragments of Redemption* 171).

In Milton's attempted master-narrative Eve is archivally once removed from God and, therefore, divinity. However, having traversed the topology of the signified by means of her *moi* text, Eve (re)touches her divinity by a remembrance in the mythic narrative through the reader-narrator that "leads [her genealogically] back" to her association with Asherah and the Mother Goddess. As a result of this remembrance, redemption for Eve lies in the other history that remains unsaid in the narrative concentricity that is the multiplicity of incessantly sliding symbolic orders in the unconsciousness of the intertext. But overturning or creating a (sub)version of the Miltonic command will be highly problematic given the entrenched nature of *Paradise*

Lost's archival status and its *fixing* of Woman, through Eve, as the bringer of Sin and Death into the world. Nevertheless, because Eve, as a trace-of-the-Goddess-in-the-text, enters the intertext by means of her disruption of the concentric language in *Paradise Lost* through a remembrance in the *moi* as Other, she attains a space in alterity that assures her a redemption by way of the mythic narrative that exists in the intertext's unconsciousness. The reader-narrator brings to *Paradise Lost* a conscious remembrance of the intertext, which is the analogon or *reverse face of the text*. Because of this remembrance, the reader-narrator, as *an*(*O*)*ther that knows* in the unconscious dimension of the text, makes use of that intertext to obtain the reverse face of Eve as a trace-of-the-Goddess-in-the-intertext. Since with remembrance comes redemption, it is up to the reader-narrator to access the various narratives overlapping in narrative concentricity in order to find the "modern" Goddess who can successfully redeem Eve and subvert both the Miltonic command and, as a result, the archive.

Using the intertext as a mnemonic reference the reader-narrator is able to determine that due to *Paradise Lost's* archival status the poem inhabits narrative spaces in concentricity that extend beyond its original *fixity* as an attempted master-narrative, an attempted master-narrative that Milton "intended" to be the last *Word*. The Miltonic command inherent in *Paradise Lost* itself draws on narrative concentricity by way of its use of a multiplicity of past narratives such as the Bible, classical myths, philosophies, English poetry, etc. Although Milton "intended" the poem to be representative of the last *Word*, an "intention" that is supported by its archival status and its "fixity" in the sociolect, its "meaning" nevertheless extends beyond that "fixity" and *into* the intertext. *Paradise Lost* therefore begins to influence every discourse that immediately follows it,

whether it is theologic discourse, scientific discourse, poetry, narrative prose, or fiction. One obvious intertextual example is, of course, Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* in which she challenges the Miltonic command concerning the difference between man and woman in the lines:

> Not equal, as thir sex not equal seem'd:
> For contemplation hee and valor form'd,
> For softness shee and sweet attractive Grace,
> Hee for God only, shee for God in him. . . . (4.296-9)

Wollstonecraft pointedly challenges this command by writing:

> Thus Milton describes our first frail mother; though when he tells us that women are formed for softness and sweet attractive grace, I cannot comprehend his meaning, unless, in the true Mahometan strain, he meant to deprive us of souls, and insinuate that we were beings only designed by sweet attractive grace, and docile blind obedience, to gratify the senses of man when he can no longer soar on the wing of contemplation. (19)

Of course, Wollstonecraft knows exactly what Milton meant in his command, which is partly the reason she wrote the book. However, Wollstonecraft's project is to elaborate on the rights of Woman, not to redeem Eve *per se*. To find redemption for Eve in the narrative concentricity of the intertext the reader-narrator must look elsewhere, particularly in the area of the fictive literature that followed *Paradise Lost*.

In the area of fiction there are numerous examples of novels and poetry that followed *Paradise Lost* and are influenced by its Miltonic command. A list of a few

major examples influenced by this command might be Daniel Defoe's *Moll Flanders* and *Roxana*, Richardson's *Clarissa*, Fanny Burney's *Evelina*, William Blake's *Milton*, Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*, and D. H. Lawrence's *The Rainbow*. With the exception of Blake's (re)membering of Milton and Lawrence's Ursula in *The Rainbow* (a Goddess who does not have to redeem Eve), all of these examples in the intertext contain female characters who are either prostitutes or women of softness and sweet attractive grace that strictly adhere to the Miltonic command. Therefore, it is safe to say that all the literature that followed *Paradise Lost* was influenced, in one way or another, by the Miltonic command that condemns Woman as the bringer of Sin and Death into the world. However, in each of these examples, including many others in the intertext, there is little if any evidence that I have found of a *successful* redemption for Eve by any author *or* his or her characters, save for Thomas Hardy's Tess.

It has been suggested, however, that Richardson's *Clarissa* successfully redeems Eve. R. Paul Yoder rightly points out in his essay "Clarissa Regained: Richardson's Redemption of Eve," that "*Paradise Lost* is often noted as one of the literary sources for Richardson's *Clarissa*" (86). Yoder goes on to say that *Clarissa* is Richardson's "reimaging of *Paradise Lost*" and that "Richardson creates a character who is able to redeem Eve, and so all women, in a way that Milton's epics [particularly *Paradise Regained*] could not, given their alignment with the epic tradition of the 'one necessary man'" (86). *Clarissa*, it seems, is the only literary source mentioned in the intertext as a possible venue by which Eve attains redemption. However, I find Yoder's argument to be flawed, a flaw that I will deal with in chapter three, because he states that "Richardson

could not depict overtly supernatural characters, so the key allegorical identifications of the forces of good and evil had to be accomplished *indirectly* by the allusions, tropes, or other figures used by or associated with the principal figures" (86; emphasis added). The key to Eve's redemption, as I theorize it, resides precisely in the direct use by an author of overtly supernatural characters. Any use by an author of characters who are not overtly supernatural, and only indirectly associated with that supernaturalness, tends to prohibit the acquisition by those characters of the trace that dwells in the alterity of narrative concentricity. Such characters remain all too real in a *realistic* novel *and* all too human in there representation. As a result of this separation from the supernatural in *Clarissa* there is seemingly no way in which Clarissa may be associated with the Goddess genealogically, intertextually, or *otherwise*. Her indirect relationship to the supernatural precludes any acquisition of the trace in the alterity of narrative concentricity by which she might offer redemption to Eve. In addition to this lack of supernaturalness in Clarissa, Yoder further states that "[i]n order for Eve to be redeemed, a woman must prove that woman *per se* can stand against temptation" (89). Yoder's rationale is questionable given the fact that he attributes Clarissa's stand against temptation to present itself after her rape, or Fall. He then contends that Clarissa's death is a "moral triumph" for Woman (98), a triumph by which Eve is redeemed because a "woman can stand against temptation" (97). He also asserts that by her death in the novel Clarissa "[offers] a *standard to be imitated by women*" (91; emphasis added). However, the means by which Clarissa dies in the novel, and its *underlying intention*, suggests more a Nietzschean *will to power* ("the ascetic's slow destruction of his [or her own] body," or slow suicide to attain *earthly power*") and *imagined* sainthood rather than a redemption in

Christian divinity for Woman *or* Eve (Nietzsche 121). Clarissa's *will to death* after her rape is merely a *will to power* that leaves whatever "spirit" she may have had locked in an earthly, concentric Logos that resembles more a Miltonic command than a goddess-like redemption for anyone. As Gillian Beer points out, by her death "Clarissa becomes a saint [and I suggest she becomes an *imagined saint*], but she is not a redemptress; she withstands temptation, *saves her own soul*, but *cannot save mankind*, not even the particular man she loves" (qtd. in Yoder 96; emphasis added). This *will to power* by Clarissa hardly represents a standard to be imitated by women. Because Clarissa's *will to power* cannot even save mankind how can she possibly redeem Eve? Clarissa's narrative essence therefore remains bound to the Miltonic command and is unable to enter the alterity of narrative concentricity through which Eve's redemption must be accomplished.

Given that so far only Clarissa has been offered as a possible intertextual source of redemption for Eve and, as has been demonstrated, she does not exhibit the necessary supernaturalness to accomplish that redemption, who in the intertext does have the necessary qualities to effect a successful redemption of Eve? Clearly there are many Goddess figures in literature from which to choose, yet none of them have been offered as likely redeemers. Therefore, I would like to suggest that it is Tess in Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* that finally, and successfully, redeems Eve and frees her from her subjugation in the Miltonic command. As with Richardson's *Clarissa*, Hardy's *Tess* also draws upon *Paradise Lost* as one of its main literary sources. Because the novel is so clearly Miltonic in its symbolism I believe Hardy uses the novel, and especially Tess, to subvert the Miltonic command and thereby redeem Eve through Tess. As one of the "most memorable women characters in all literature," Tess "haunts the imagination" and,

I would suggest, the unconsciousness of the imagination wherein the mythic narrative resides (Stave 101). Tess is a Goddess figure of "immense stature" in the intertext who "exists in time while she remains timeless" (101). This timelessness associated with Tess suggests that she exists both in mythic time (a time and hour of her own) and in the alterity of narrative concentricity that touches the unconsciousness of the mythic narrative. In addition, Hardy's *Tess* "returns to the great myth . . . , the Ashtaroth-Yahweh struggle" (101). Ashtaroth is also known as *Asherah*, Ashtoreth, Ashtart, Istar, Isis, etc., "the many-named Divine Ancestress" or Mother Goddess (Stone 9). The fact that Hardy directly associates *Tess* with the Ashtaroth-Yehweh (or Asherah-Yehweh) myth, he thus directly associates Tess with Asherah, a genealogic association that includes Eve. Tess's direct association with the supernatural, as Goddess, allows her to enter the alterity of narrative concentricity and traverse the succession of symbolic orders in the unconsciousness of the intertext as an *otherwise than being*. She is therefore able to enter the unconscious dimension of the intertext as an *otherwise than being* in order to effect a remembrance of the other history that remains unsaid. Her Otherness, then, as a trace-of-Being-in-the-intertext will allow her, as a trace-of-the-Goddess, to successfully redeem Eve and subvert the Miltonic command. The following chapters in this analysis will demonstrate just how Tess is able to accomplish this redemption and, as a result, cause Milton's concentric, archival discourse to slide incessantly out of control in narrative concentricity as a (sub)version of the Said in the Saying of the Goddess's other history.

CHAPTER 3

TESS OF THE D'URBERVILLES: THE GODDESS SACRIFICES HERSELF

From the very beginning of Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, Tess is set apart from other women in the novel when she appears at a "Pagan Mayday fertility ritual" (Stave 101) involving a "May-Day dance" around a central pole (Hardy 6). Tess is set apart in this ritual because she "wore a red ribbon in her hair, and was the only one of the white company who could boast of such a pronounced adornment" (6). Hardy clearly establishes Tess as a woman who functions in the novel as

> one differentiated and marked, as one whose experience and consciousness are essentially different from those of her would-be peers, as one whose life is fated to enact a story *already narrated* and concluded. Read mythically, she becomes emblematic of the Great Goddess, the *informing spirit* of a Pagan consciousness. (Stave 101; emphasis added)

Although Shirley Stave's assessment of Tess at this point is essentially correct, she goes on to say that by Tess's death later in the novel the "goddess herself is lost to the world and with her goes the possibility of renewal" (106). Stave ultimately believes that although Tess's existence in the novel "occurs in prehistory, in mythic time and space," the fact that "historical time invades the mythic, seizes it, carries it off, and kills it," Tess's death represents a devouring of her by history thus killing her existence in mythic time (120). This analysis clearly suggests that Tess is a fallen Goddess destroyed by the patriarchal archive. However, if, as Stave has previously suggested, Tess is an *informing*

spirit, one whose story has *already been narrated*, her death as that spirit should allow her to regain mythic time so that she may effect a narrative (sub)version of the archive in which the historical exists. This narrative possibility exists in Stave's statement that "[m]ythic time and historical time can only overlap for brief moments," but it is precisely in these brief moments of overlap (into narrative concentricity) that Tess escapes through death into mythic time (120).

Because Tess is a Goddess of immense stature, one who is emblematic of the Great Goddess, her appearance at the May-Day dance is emblematic of the vegetation rituals around the Maypole that suggests "the worship of the cult pole of Asherah, the goddess of heaven" (Neumann 259). Since Hardy's *Tess returns* to the great myth of the Ashtaroth-Yahweh struggle, Tess is clearly being associated with the "Creator of all Deities," Asherah. By this association, then, Hardy has created a genealogical relationship in which Tess's existence not only resides in mythic time, it continues to reside in mythic time even after she is apparently devoured in death by the archive. Tess is a trace of that Goddess in the text, a trace-of-the-Goddess-in-the-text that *returns*, through mythic time, to narrate the Saying of the Goddess in the Said of the archive that has tried to obliterate it (the Saying) by silencing the Goddess. Historical discourse and, therefore, the archive cannot completely obliterate the trace in which this genealogic relationship resides because the trace exists in prehistory. The trace continues to exist in the narrative concentricity wherein the Goddess becomes "the sign of something absent, a something which has already happened . . . , a 'relic' or a 'trace'" (Miller 119). Tess therefore possesses the trace of the Goddess as a presence-in-absence that has traversed the narrative concentricity of the incessantly sliding symbolic orders in the

unconsciousness of the intertext. Moreover, by returning to the Asherah-Yahweh struggle in *Tess*, Hardy is clearly associating Tess with Eve who is the Canaanite authors' *human* substitute for Asherah. Many times in the novel Tess's association with Eve is plainly stated. For instance, when Tess is with Angel Clare in the mead near Talbothays Dairy the narrative states, "The spectral, half-compounded, aqueous light which pervaded the open mead impressed them with a feeling of isolation, as if they were Adam and Eve" (102). Tess also regards, or looks upon, Angel "as Eve at her second waking might have regarded Adam" (133). Not only does the novel explicitly associate Tess with Eve, it also draws on both Genesis and *Paradise Lost* as sources, especially *Paradise Lost*.

It is clear that, as a mythographer, Hardy is specifically addressing the Miltonic myth in his novel. He is, as I contend, using Tess as a vehicle by which the Miltonic command may be successfully subverted. In order to do so Hardy distinctly establishes Tess as a mythological hero(ine) who, as a trace-of-the-Goddess-in-the-text, must embark on an adventure by which she can ultimately and successfully redeem Eve. Tess's adventure progresses through what Joseph Campbell calls the monomyth, or mythic narrative. The adventure that the hero(ine) must brave is a palingenesic (new birth) adventure, or palingenesic *round*, in which she sets

> *forth from* [her] *commanday hut or castle, is lured, carried away, or else voluntarily proceeds, to the threshold of adventure. There* [she] *encounters a shadow presence that guards the passage. The* [hero(ine] *may defeat or conciliate this power and go alive into the kingdom of the dark (brother-battle, dragon-battle; offering, charm), or be slain by the opponent and descend in death (dismemberment, crucifixion). Beyond the*

> *threshold, then, the* [hero(ine)] *journeys through a world of unfamiliar yet strangely intimate forces, some of which severely threaten* [her] *(tests), some of which give magical aid (helpers). When* [she] *arrives at the nadir of the mythological round,* [she] *undergoes a supreme ordeal and gains* [her] *reward. The triumph may be represented as the* [hero(ine's)] *sexual union with the goddess-mother of the world (sacred marriage),* [her] *recognition by the father-creator (father-atonement),* [her] *own divinization (apotheosis), or again—if the powers have remained unfriendly to* [her]—[her] *theft of the boon* [she] *came to gain (bride-theft, fire-theft); intrinsically it is an expansion of consciousness and therewith of being (illumination, transfiguration, freedom). The final work is that of the return. If the powers have blessed the* [hero(ine)], [she] *now sets forth under their protection (emissary); if not,* [she] *flees and is pursued (transformation flight, obstacle flight). At the return threshold the transcendental powers must remain behind; the* [hero(ine)] *re-emerges from the kingdom of dread (return, ressurection). The boon that* [she] *brings restores the world (elixir).* (*Hero* 245-6)

Tess's palingenesic adventure, as a trace-of-the-Goddess-in-the-text, begins with the call to adventure. Tess's call to adventure is initiated when her father discovers, by way of Parson Tringham, that her family is descended from "the lineal representatives of the ancient and knightly family of the d'Urbervilles [*sic*]" (Hardy 1). After an incident in which Prince, the family horse and breadwinner, is accidentally killed on the way to market, Tess is convinced by her mother to go to Trantridge "on the edge o' The Chase"

(17) where there lives "a very rich Mrs [*sic*] d'Urberville" who must be their "relation" (24). Reluctantly, Tess agrees to go to Trantridge to meet with Mrs. d'Urberville, and this location becomes Tess's threshold of adventure. It is here, at Trantridge, that Tess meets Alec d'Urberville, the shadow presence that guards her passage into the palingenesic adventure. When Tess arrives at the d'Urberville mansion "she stood like a bather about to make his plunge, . . .

> when a figure came forth *from the dark* triangular door of [a] tent. It was that of a tall young man, *smoking*.
>
> He had an almost *swarthy complexion*, with full lips, badly moulded, though red and smooth, above which was a well-groomed *black moustache with curled points*, though his age could not be more than three- or four-and-twenty. Despite the *touches of barbarism in his contours* there was a singular force in the gentleman's face, and his bold rolling eye. (28; emphasis added)

Alec d'Urberville emerges from the dark shrouded in smoke, and with his black moustache with curled points and touches of barbarism in his swarthy contours he represents the classic illustration of a villain. Indeed, Alec is regarded as one of Hardy's Satan figures and is frequently portrayed in the novel as "surrounded by smoke," and at night the glowing tip of his cigar "is often the first sign of his presence" (Stave 110). As a Satan figure, Alec represents the serpent, "the rejected one," and is the "representative of that unconscious deep ('so deep that the bottom cannot be seen') wherein are hoarded all of the rejected, unadmitted, unrecognized, unknown, or undeveloped factors, laws, and elements of existence" (Campbell, *Hero* 52). Alec therefore hoards the Saying that

the trace-of-the-Goddess, as hero(ine), must appropriate by means of her palingenesic adventure. Alec is the "herald or announcer" of the adventure, a herald who is often portrayed as "dark, loathly, or terrifying, judged evil by the world; yet if one could follow, the way would be opened through the walls of day into the dark where the jewels glow" (53). Tess does follow through the walls of day into the dark and, thus:

> . . . the thing began. Had she perceived this meeting's import she might have asked why she was doomed to be seen and coveted that day by the wrong man, and not by some other man, the right and desired one in all respects—as nearly as humanity can supply the right and desired. . . . (Hardy 30-1)

Tess packs up and leaves her "commanday hut" in Blackmore and moves into the d'Urberville mansion. This location is where Tess crosses her first threshold into the palingenesic adventure. The threshold occurs on an evening when Tess decides to go to a dance in Chaseborough and is later "seduced or raped" by Alec in the thick darkness of The Chase, "the oldest wood in England" (55). After the dance Tess decides to walk with a group of her intoxicated "companions" the three miles through The Chase to her "home." Along the way Alec "silently" emerges from a hedge on horseback and confronts the "workfolk." Tess's "companions" take to the "field-path" leaving her alone with Alec. Alec then takes charge of escorting Tess home when "a faint luminous fog, which had hung in the hollows all the evening, became general, and enveloped them." (54). In order to "prolong his companionship" with Tess, Alec "manages" to get them lost in the "thick darkness of The Chase" (56-7). While Alec "attempts" to determine just where they are in The Chase, Tess falls asleep beneath the moonlight. Tess's "seduction

or rape" occurs once Alec returns to her and is described in an important passage that has Miltonic significance. The passage reads:

> D'Urberville stooped; and heard a gentle regular breathing. He knelt and bent lower, till her breath warmed his face, and in a moment his cheek was in contact with hers She was sleeping soundly, and upon her eyelashes there lingered tears.
>
> Darkness and silence ruled everywhere around. Above them rose the primeval yews and oaks of The Chase, in which were poised gentle roosting birds in their last nap; and about them stole the hopping rabbits and hares. But, might some say, where was Tess's guardian angel? where was the providence of her simple faith? Perhaps, like that other god of whom the ironical Tishbite spoke, he was talking, or he was pursuing, or he was in journey, or he was sleeping and not to be awakened.
>
> Why it was that upon this beautiful feminine tissue, sensitive as gossamer, and practically blank as snow as yet, there should have been traced such a coarse pattern as it was doomed to receive; why so often the coarse appropriates the finer thus, the wrong man the woman, the wrong woman the man, many thousand years of analytical philosophy have failed to explain to our sense of order. One may, indeed, admit the possibility of retribution lurking in the present catastrophe. Doubtless some of Tess d'Urberville's mailed ancestors rollicking home from a fray had dealt the same measure even more ruthlessly toward peasant girls of their time. But

> though to visit the sins of the fathers upon their children may be a morality good enough for divinities, it is scorned by average human nature; and it therefore does not mend the matter.
>
> As Tess's own people down in those retreats are never tired of saying among each other in their fatalistic way: 'It was to be'. There lay the pity of it. An immeasurable social chasm was to divide our heroine's personality there-after from that previous self of hers who stepped from her mother's door to try her fortune at Trantridge poultry-farm. (57-8)

J. Hillis Miller describes this passage as Tess's "violation" because "[t]o call it either rape or seduction would beg the fundamental questions which the book raises, the questions of the meaning of Tess's experience and of its causes" (117). I agree with Miller's analysis that Tess's call to adventure (which is what this scene represents) is a violation and not a seduction or rape. Although Hardy was "not free to describe such a scene literally," the scene nevertheless exists in an equivocal space that is overdetermined and resides "on the margins of the narration" (118). The violation perpetrated on Tess as a trace-of-the-Goddess has always already occurred in the incessantly sliding symbolic orders of narrative concentricity, and Hardy's overdetermined text captures the trace and "repeats its Biblical prototype" (132). Tess's call to adventure in the palingenesic *round* thus enters the circularity of narrative concentricity as (an)other symbolic order that opens up a space in alterity wherein the trace-of-the-Goddess *remembers* her ancestral precursor(s).

Tess's remembrance, as a trace-of-the-Goddess, resides in a knowledge from the Other that places lingering tears upon her eyelashes. Although Tess is sound asleep

before Alec violates her, the lingering tears on her eyelashes prior to her violation suggests a pre-existing knowledge stemming from the *otherwise than being* in alterity, a knowledge that gives Tess a sense of being *an*(*O*)*ther that knows*. Nevertheless, at this point in the text Tess possesses only a *sense* of the *Other that knows*, but the text, as Other, knows and repeats its Biblical prototype. As a trace-of-the-Goddess, Tess is violated where "Darkness and silence ruled everywhere around," suggesting the darkness and silence of the Saying in the other history of the Goddess that the Miltonic command has repressed. As a representation of Satan, Alec's violation of Tess appears to inflict a falleness on her in order to make her his creature to silence and command. Once Alec's violation begins (in equivocal space), the shadow that hangs over that narrative space in the "primeval yews and oaks of The Chase" is the shadow of the Miltonic command. The narrative asks, "where was Tess's guardian angel?" Clearly, Tess's guardian angel resides in the alterity of narrative concentricity; however, Alec's guardian angel, Satan, hovers over him in a Miltonic presence-in-absence wherein:

> Thence up he flew, and on the Tree of Life,
> The middle Tree and highest there that grew,
> Sat like a Cormorant; yet not true Life
> Thereby regain'd, but sat devising Death
> To them who liv'd; nor on the virtue thought
> Of that life-giving Plant, but only us'd
> For prospect, what well us'd had been the pledge
> Of immortality. So little knows
> Any, but God alone, to value right

The good before him, but prevents best things

To worst abuse, or to thir meanest use. (4.194-204)

Alec's Satanic essence in the novel sits above him on the "Tree of Life" like a guardian "Cormorant" that represents patriarchal/Miltonic Death. Satan's presence-in-absence, by way of Alec, appropriates the Tree of Life (which in Genesis 3 is in the "midst," or center, of the garden), the Maypole, and attempts to hide it from the trace-of-the-Goddess in the darkness and silence among the yews and oaks of The Chase. As a result of this repetition of silencing, the Tree of Life/Maypole (the Goddess's Tree) is again decentered and the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil (also in the "midst" of the garden) remains as the only tree in the center of the patriarchal story. This repetition represents the Miltonic command's attempt to retain the silence of the Goddess's real story, or other history, and denies her right to knowledge *in* that other history. The silencing occurs in the idea of "seduction" suggested in the equivocal space of the violation scene. The suggestion is that Tess, like Eve, repeats the Miltonic command that, "The Serpent me beguil'd and I did eat" (10.162). This suggestion in turn repeats the command that states, "Earth felt the wound" after Eve eats of the forbidden fruit and, thereafter, "Nature from her seat / Sighing through all her Works gave signs of woe, / That all was lost" (9.782-4). Indeed, even Alec says to Tess, laughingly, "I am sorry to wound you" (Hardy 60). However, this repetition inflicts a false falleness on Tess because she is always already fallen in the trace (as a genealogic representative of the Goddess Asherah) and her death is already predetermined in the unconsciousness of the intertext that retains the mythic narrative. Because of this pre-existing falleness, Tess, as a trace-of-the-Goddess, enters into a palingenesic adventure that admits to the "possibility

of retribution lurking in the present situation," but a retribution that comes by way of her "dragon-battle" with Alec (and eventually with Angel Clare) that subverts the Miltonic command and brings a boon to culture. In order to accomplish this (sub)version of the Miltonic command, however, Tess must go beyond the threshold of violation and journey through a world of unfamiliar yet strangely intimate forces, some of which severely test her and some of which give her magical aid. Tess accepts this palingenesic call to adventure and crosses the threshold of her violation thus entering an unfamiliar world back in Marlott that, when her eyes had last fallen upon it, "she had learnt that the serpent hisses where the sweet birds sing" (58).

Tess's first test in this unfamiliar world comes with the birth of her child Sorrow, the result of Alec's violation of her. Sorrow represents God's and, therefore, Milton's command to Eve that, "Thy sorrow I will greatly multiply / By thy Conception; Children thou shalt bring / In sorrow forth" (10.193-5). Tess brings forth Sorrow and, as an unmarried mother in patriarchal society, she feels herself the object of shame, the "guilty shame" imposed on Eve after the Fall (9.158). Tess's sorrow, on the other hand, is greatly compounded when she reaches home one afternoon to find that Sorrow has suddenly taken ill and is dying. Believing this event to be inevitable due to the baby's "puny" frame, Tess's attitude toward this palingenesic test becomes one of immense resolve wherein the baby's

> offence against society in coming into the world was forgotten by the girl-mother; her soul's desire was to continue that offence by preserving the life of the child. However, it soon grew clear that the hour of emancipation for that little prisoner of the flesh was to arrive earlier than

her worst misgivings had conjectured. And when she had discovered this she was plunged into a misery which transcended that of the child's simple loss. *Her baby had not been baptized*.

Tess had drifted into a frame of mind which accepted passively the consideration that, if she should have to burn for what she had done, burn she must, and there was an end to it. Like all village girls she was well grounded in the Holy Scriptures, and had dutifully studied the histories of Aholah and Aholibah [the two prostitutes in Ezekiel 23.2-35], and knew the inference to be drawn therefrom. But when the same question arose with regard to the baby it had a very different colour. Her darling was about to die, *and no salvation*. (Hardy 72-3; emphasis added)

Realizing that the hour of Sorrow's emancipation form earthly condemnation into a dominion without salvation was at hand, Tess takes matters into her own hands knowing that "no parson should come inside" her father's house to perform a baptism for the child (74). Tess gathers her siblings around her and the child and "sets about baptizing" Sorrow (74). At this point in the text, Tess begins the process of acquiring supernatural aid for her palingenesic journey. Tess's "high enthusiasm" for her baptismal task had "a *transfiguring effect* upon the face which had been her undoing, showing it as a thing of *immaculate beauty*, with *a touch of dignity* which was *almost regal*" (74; emphasis added). With the "little ones" kneeling around her, Tess takes on the mantle of priest(ess) and says, "'SORROW, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost'. She sprinkled the water, and there was silence" (74). By baptizing Sorrow herself, Tess decenters Christian orthodoxy and instills in herself the

regal status of priest(ess) and appropriates the phallic *power* of the Name-of-the-Father as her own. Tess more firmly appropriates the trace-of-the-Goddess through the "ecstasy of her faith" (the faith *in herself*), which "*almost* apotheosized her" (74; emphasis added). The *almost* of the trace-of-the-Goddess that Tess acquires made her look "as a being large, towering and awful, *a divine personage*" with whom those around her "had nothing in common" (75; emphasis added). Tess has now gained enormous supernatural power by means of her decentering and thus appropriating the Name-of-the-Father. When Tess goes to the parish priest to ask "will it be just the same for him as if you had baptized him?," the priest "was disposed to say no" (75). But,

> . . . the dignity of the girl, the strange tenderness in her voice, combined to affect his nobler impulses—or rather those that he had left in him after ten years of endeavour to graft technical belief on actual scepticism. The man and the ecclesiastic fought within him, and the victory fell to the man.
>
> "My dear girl," he said, "it will be just the same." (75)

The supernatural power that Tess has now acquired causes the priest to "assure her *against his reason* that her action is acceptable" (Stave 102). The trace-of-the-Goddess is becoming more fully developed in Tess and her genealogic association to the Goddess suggests that she is also a trace of the Wisdom Goddess. The text will later state that, "*The wisdom* of her love for him [Angel Clare], as love, sustained her dignity; *she seemed to be wearing a crown*" (Hardy 151; emphasis added). Even at this point in the text, immediately after her baptism of Sorrow, Tess's dignity, regal bearing, and divine personage suggests that she is already "wearing" the crown of the Goddess.

Nevertheless, Tess takes yet one more step in her acquisition of supernatural aid necessary for her palingenesic journey. Tess instinctively/intuitively *knows* that:

> "By experience, . . . we find out a short way by a long wandering." Not seldom that long wandering unfits us for further travel, and of what use is our experience to us then? Tess Durbeyfield's experience was of this incapacitating kind. At last she had learned what to do; but who would now accept her doing? (77)

Tess *knows* (which suggests that she *is* the *Other that knows* in the text) that she must embark on a journey, a palingenesic journey that will bring a new birth in the other history that remains unsaid in the archive. However, prior to this journey Tess must undergo a transfiguration that will aid her in the tests that will confront her along the way. This transfiguration comes when

> [s]he suddenly thought one afternoon, *when looking in the glass* at her fairness, that *there was yet another date, of greater importance to her* than those [involving her birthday, violation, and Sorrow's birth and death]; a day which lay sly and unseen among all the other days of the year, giving no sign or sound when she annually passed over it; but not the less surely there. When was it? Why did she not feel the chill of each yearly encounter with such a cold relation? She had Jeremy Taylor's thought that *some time in the future* those who had known her would say "It is the—th, the day that poor Tess Durbeyfield died"; and there would be nothing singular to their minds in the statement. Of that day, *doomed to be her terminus in time* through all the ages, she did not know the

> place and month, week, season, or year.
>
> *Almost at a leap Tess thus changed* from simple girl to complex woman. Symbols of reflectiveness passed into her face, and a note of tragedy at times into her voice. Her eyes grew larger and more eloquent. She became what would have been called a fine creature; her aspect was fair and arresting; her soul that of a woman whom the turbulent experiences of the last year or two had quite failed to demoralize. But for the world's opinion those experiences would have been simply a liberal education. (77; emphasis added)

Tess's transfiguration involves a rebirth, a rebirth that comes to her almost at a leap as she is looking at herself in a mirror. Tess undergoes a retroactive mirror stage in which, as Lacan says:

> We have only to understand the mirror stage *as an identification*, in the full sense that analysis gives to the term: namely, the transformation that takes place in the subject when [she] assumes an image—whose predestination to this phase-effect is sufficiently indicated by the use, in analytic theory, of the ancient term *imago*. (Lacan, *Écrits* 2)

Tess, in her transformation/identification in the mirror stage, effects a transfiguration by which she assumes the *ancient* image of the Goddess, a libidinal dynamism in an ontological structure that assumes the *libido sciendi*, the lust to know (2). Tess confers upon herself a Goddess status and finds the "already there" wherein she "appears to be what she will *only later* [truly] *become*" (Gallop 78). Having (re)membered herself in the mirror stage, Tess knows that "some time in the future" her

time and hour will come in which she truly becomes an entity of "greater importance." Tess enters the *libido sciendi* of narrative concentricity as an enhanced trace-of-the-Goddess and knows that some time in the future the "hour of truth" will come for her (Lacan, "Desire and the Interpretation of Desire in *Hamlet*" 17). The time and hour of truth for Tess will be in the future time and hour of her own death. By transfiguring herself, through the retroactive mirror stage, into the ancient *imago* of the Goddess, Tess reveals a lack of fear of Death thus acknowledging a future taking on of Death as Life. Therefore, in the interval before her Death, Tess's will, "on the way to death but a death ever future, [and] exposed to death but not *immediately*, has time to be for the Other" (Levinas, *Totality and Infinity* 236). In being for the Other in Death Tess will become a "being-for-death" that will signify an authority "*after and despite my death*," which will announce "a meaningful order beyond this death" (*Time and the Other* 114). Tess is now suspended in the time of the Other (the text, intertext, and the mythic narrative) and through her palingenesic journey will seek the "hour of the Other" in "the dimension of accomplishment" (17-24). Tess's palingenesic journey becomes her dimension of accomplishment in which she seeks the pre-history of her ancient *imago*, the other history that contains the Saying of the Goddess in the Said. Given her entrance into this *libido sciendi*, Tess knows that "women whose chief companions are the forms of Nature retain in their souls far more of the Pagan fantasy of their remote forefathers than of the systematized religion taught their race at [a] later date" (Hardy 81). Tess has transfigured herself into an essence of immense stature, a Nature/Mother Goddess trace beyond what she was "before she had eaten of the tree of knowledge" (81). She has now acquired the necessary supernatural aid to assist her in her palingenesic journey. In essence, Tess, by

her own transfiguration, "has come under the protection of the Cosmic Mother," or Mother Goddess (with whom she shares the trace), "and cannot be harmed" (Campbell, *Hero* 71). Therefore, Tess cannot be harmed by external forces during her journey, thus she is free to pursue a self-appointed time and hour of truth toward a being-for-death in her dimension of accomplishment. Although Tess's supernatural aid is

> [p]rotective and dangerous, motherly and fatherly at the same time [dangerously androgynous], this supernatural principle of guardianship and direction unites in itself all the ambiguities of the unconscious—thus signifying the support of [her] conscious personality by that other, larger system, but also the inscrutability of the guide that [she is] following, to the peril of all [her] rational ends.
>
> The hero[ine] to whom such a helper appears is typically one who has responded to the call. (73)

Tess does respond to the call and her palingenesic journey *is supported* by that other, larger system of the unconscious, the Other. During Tess's journey, then, she is in and for the Other, and its subject-matter is the supernatural "*looming through some other history*" (Felman 125). This other history is the unsaid Saying of the Goddess repressed in the Said that Tess will ultimately obtain as a being-for-death in the hour of the Other. Tess's hour of the Other will come with her death at the end of the novel wherein she appropriates freedom by being "by and for the [O]ther" (Handelman, *Fragments of Redemption* 249). Responding to the call Tess crosses into the road of trials where she is "swallowed into the unknown" toward a "form of self-annihilation" to be born again in the Other (Campbell, *Hero* 90-1). Tess's palingenesic journey begins by her responding

to the call "between two and three years after [her] return from Trantridge" when "she left home for a second time" (Hardy 79). Tess travels to Var Vale and takes employment at Talbothays Dairy as a dairymaid. It is during this time at Talbothays Dairy that Tess meets Angel Clare, the young man who earlier in the novel "had danced with others but not with her" at the May Dance (88). Angel is the youngest of three sons belonging to the "Reverent Mr Clare at Eminster." Angel's two brothers have both become parsons, whereas Angel does not because his object is to "acquire a practical skill in the various processes of farming" (89). Although Angel proclaims to "love the Church as one loves a parent," he believes he cannot honestly be ordained a minister like his brothers because the Church "refuses to liberate her mind from an untenable redemptive theolatry" (90). Angel's father seriously wanted him to become a minister and

> tried argument, persuasion, [and] entreaty. "No, father; I cannot underwrite Article Four (leave alone the rest) taking it 'in the literal and grammatical sense' as required by the Declaration; and therefore I can't be a parson in the present state of affairs," said Angel. "My whole instinct in matters of religion is towards reconstruction; to quote your favourite Epistle to the Hebrews, '*the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain*.'" (91)

Angel rejects the "redemptive theolatry" of the Church as outlined in the 39 Articles of Religion (91). For Angel to "underwrite" Article Four he would have to believe that "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature" (91n7). Angel

rejects this theology of redemption because he sees himself as intellectually emancipated and, therefore, has no need for such religious contrivances (Mitchell, "Narcissism and Death" 4). However, this rejection by Angel of Article Four suggests something psychologically much deeper and darker in him. This "religious stance" suggests that Angel no longer believes in life after death and, as a result, has both "the fear of life and the fear of death" (Becker 53). Although Angel's fear of death does not allow him to believe in Christian redemption he "seems to have a powerful wish for resurrection," albeit a resurrection *for himself* and no one else (Mitchell, "Narcissism" 4).

At first glance, however, Angel appears to be "the right and desired" man for Tess, at least "as nearly as humanity can supply" him. His very name suggests an angelic quality that would seem to indicate his being the perfect match for Tess. At Talbothays he lives in an attic above her and plays the harp like some heavenly figure sent to save this fallen milkmaid. However, prior to their marriage Angel idealizes Tess to the extent that he sees her as a goddess, "a virginal daughter of Nature" (Hardy 95). Angel sees Tess as "a visionary essence of woman" and compares her to the goddesses Artemis and Demeter," comparisons that Tess "did not like because she did not understand them" (103). Tess, as a trace-of-the-Goddess-in-the-text, would not understand these comparisons because, genealogically, she is not related to these goddesses who, at this time, reside outside of her own lineage. Nevertheless, Angel sees her as a goddess, albeit a goddess rooted in the Miltonic command. In one of Hardy's many clear references to *Paradise Lost* he places Angel and Tess in a mead at Talbothays, where:

> The spectral, half-compounded, aqueous light which pervaded the open mead impressed them with a feeling of isolation, as if they were Adam and

> Eve. At this dim inceptive stage of the day Tess seemed to Clare to exhibit a dignified largeness both of disposition and physique, an *almost* regnant power—possibly because he knew that at that preternatural time hardly any woman so well-endowed in person as she was likely to be walking in the open air within the boundaries of his horizon; very few in all England. Fair women are usually asleep at midsummer dawns. She was close at hand, and the rest were nowhere.
>
> The mixed, singular, luminous gloom in which they walked along together to the spot where the cows lay, often made him think of *the Resurrection-hour*. He little thought that the *Magdalen might be at his side*. (102; emphasis added)

The impression of the scene that both Angel and Tess have is fixed in the Miltonic command. Tess's impression is understandable given the genealogical trace she shares with Eve, in the Other. Angel's association with Adam, on the other hand, is thoroughly grounded in the patriarchal belief that Tess/Eve represents "a whole sex condensed into one typical form" (103). Although Angel sees Tess as Eve/goddess, she has only an *almost* regnant power that does not allow her, at least in Angel's perception, the supernaturalness that she really possesses. Angel's patriarchally derived "*almost* regnant power" simply does not compare with Tess's "*almost*" regality in which the trace of the Goddess resides. Additionally, this scene also points to Angel's powerful wish for resurrection by his thoughts turning to the Resurrection-hour as they walk together in the mead. Angel's powerful wish for resurrection, although he does not believe in redemption, resides in his powerful fear of death. His associating Tess with Eve

exemplifies his unconscious belief in the Miltonic command that condemns Eve/Woman as the bringer of Sin and Death into the world. Angel's unconscious brings this knowledge forward, which is why he so closely associates Tess with the Miltonic Eve. Just prior to their marriage Angel goes to visit his parents at Eminster. Upon his return to Talbothays he slips into the house catching Tess unawares. As Tess descends the stairs toward him

> [s]he was yawning, and he saw the *red interior* of her mouth, *as if it had been a snake's*. She had stretched one arm so high above her *coiled-up* cable of hair that he could see its *satin* delicacy above the *sunburn*; her face was flushed with sleep, and her eyelids hung heavy over their pupils. The brim-fullness of her nature breathed from her. *It was a moment when woman's soul is more incarnate than at any other time; when the most spiritual beauty bespeaks itself flesh;* and sex takes the outside place in the presentation. (133; emphasis added)

Angel's unconscious, Miltonic perception of Tess forces his conscious perception to equate her with the Miltonic Eve. His immense fear of death is projected onto Tess and his vision of her echoes the passage in *Paradise Lost* when Adam says to Eve after the Fall:

> Out of my sight, thou Serpent, that name best
> Befits thee with him leagu'd, thyself as false
> And hateful; nothing wants, but that thy shape,
> Like his, and color Serpentine may show
> Thy inward fraud, to warn all Creatures from thee
> Henceforth; lest that too heav'nly form, pretended

To hellish falsehood, snare them. (10.867-73)

Angel's conscious perception of Tess is clearly grounded in his unconscious remembrance of the Miltonic command. This Miltonic remembrance forces Angel's unconscious to project onto Tess the essence of Sin and Death. Angel associates Tess with the "Serpent," seeing her "coiled-up cable of hair" as a representation of "thy shape" being "like his." The red interior of Tess's mouth and her sunburn color remind Angel of Eve's Miltonic association with the "color Serpentine" that reveals an "interior," or "inward fraud." It is in this moment of Angel's perception of Tess that his complex and contradictory personality is revealed. At once Angel sees Tess's "*satin* delicacy" (her heavenly form) as being "leagu'd" with *Satan*, whereby the "falsehood" of "woman's soul" is revealed "incarnate" and her "spiritual" (supernatural) beauty becomes merely flesh. Unconsciously, then, Tess represents for Angel Death incarnate. Yet at the same time he still idealizes Tess as a form of goddess, noting to himself that it "seemed natural enough to him, now that Tess was again in sight, to choose a mate from unconstrained Nature, and not from the abodes of Art" (Hardy 136). Although Angel idealizes Tess as a form of goddess (an *almost* goddess), his idealization is based on his fear of death, and because of his immense fear of death he plans to use her, as "goddess," to allay his fear of death through a parodic resurrection (Mitchell, "Narcissism" 4). This parodic resurrection occurs after their marriage, a marriage that Tess is reluctant to enter into due to her "fallen" past.

Over and over again Tess refuses to marry Angel because of the falleness of her "past history." She continually tries to tell Angel that history but he refuses to listen. Tess, desperately wishing to tell her history, pleads with Angel, saying, "But my history.

I want you *to know it*—you must let me tell—you will not like me so well" (Hardy 147; emphasis added). Although, *unconsciously*, Angel already does not like Tess "so well," Tess, as the *Other that knows* in the text, *knows* that her other history will cause Angel to descend deeper and deeper into the Miltonic command. However, this history is an *other* history that must be told regardless of the consequences to herself and Angel. Ultimately Tess agrees to marry Angel, and

> the day, the incredible day, on which she was to become his, loomed large in the near future. The thirty-first of December, New Year's *Eve*, was the date. His wife, she said to herself. Could it ever be? Their two selves together, nothing to divide them, every incident shared by them: why not? And yet why? (160; emphasis added)

Tess's "yet why" is revealing in that *she knows*, she knows that the other history will "divide" their "two selves" unless Angel is made aware of that "other history." In a desperate attempt to reveal her "other history" to Angel prior to their marriage Tess writes a letter in which she tells her "temporal" story. When Tess slips the letter under Angel's door the letter is accidentally slipped under the carpet where Angel cannot see it. The next day Tess is unable to detect any sign that Angel has read her letter. Indeed, he has not, which causes Tess to think that "even if he had not received it she had a sudden enthusiastic trust that he surely would forgive her" (164). This trust appears to be, yet once more, the trust of the Goddess in an effort to give patriarchal man the benefit of the doubt where forgiveness is concerned. Discovering that Angel has not read the letter, Tess goes and retrieves it from under the carpet but decides that she cannot show it to him *now* because the house was in "full bustle of preparation" for the wedding (165).

Tess does not tell Angel about the misplaced letter in which she reveals her other history to him, "but she does [continue] to point out [to him] that she made other attempts to tell him" that history (Mitchell, "Narcissism" 5). Nevertheless, Tess marries Angel *knowing* that "[h]er idolatry of this man was such that she herself *almost* feared it to be *ill-omened*" (Hardy 168; emphasis added). Tess *knows*, in the *almost* of the trace, that her marriage to Angel will be ill-omened and, as a result, once they are married additional supernatural aids appear to Tess that foretell her future history.

Tess and Angel decide to spend their honeymoon in an old farmhouse near Wellbridge. As they pass through the farmhouse's "wicket-gate" a "cock crew" three times (169). Because the cock crew three times on the day of their marriage, "Hardy has deliberately drawn parallels" to the "life and death of Christ" (Stave 109). This parallel between Tess and Christ will become clearer later in my discussion of Richardson's *Clarissa*; however, needless to say, Tess temporarily "betrays" her essence (as Goddess) by joining herself with Angel, thus compromising herself to culture (109). This compromise, I believe, is an attempt by Tess, as a trace of the Goddess, to make *known* her other history by way of a temporal agency, i.e., Angel. This compromise does not work, however, because Tess (as a trace of the Goddess) realizes that because Retty Priddle tries to drown herself (and the other milkmaids at Talbothays are also subject to Angel's unrequited love) she is therefore "the chosen one" (Hardy 175). As the "chosen one," Tess feels it incumbent upon herself, at this point, to confess her "falleness" to Angel, especially after having found out that Angel himself has "fallen." Angel has previously had a premarital sexual relationship and he tells Tess that,

> ". . . you will see what a terrible remorse it bred in me when, in the midst

> of my fine aims for other people, I myself fell."
>
> He then told her of that time of his life to which allusion has been made when, tossed about by doubts and difficulties in London, like a cork on the waves, he plunged into eight-and-forty hours' dissipation with a stranger. (177)

Angel confesses his sin to Tess and "smugly assumes that Tess will have no trouble forgiving him" (Mitchell, "Narcissism" 5). Angel says to Tess, "I felt I should like to treat you with perfect frankness and honour, and I could not do so without telling this. Do you forgive me?" (Hardy 177). Naturally, Tess, seeing the possibility of revealing the other history in the Saying, replies, "O Angel—I am almost glad—because now *you* can forgive *me*! I have not made my confession. I have a confession, too—remember, I said so" (177). Tess immediately and unconditionally forgives Angel thinking that his confession is "just the same" as hers. Because Tess believes that her sin is just the same as Angel's, she sits down with him and:

> Their hands were still joined. The ashes under the grate were *lit by the fire* vertically, *like a torrid waste*. Imagination might have beheld a *Last-Day luridness in the red-coaled glow*, which fell on his face and hand, and on hers, peering into the loose hair about her brow, and firing the delicate skin underneath. *A large shadow of her shape* rose upon the wall and ceiling. She bent forward, at which each diamond on her neck gave *a sinister wink like a toad's*; and pressing her forehead against his temple she entered on her story of her acquaintance with Alec d'Urberville and its results, murmuring the words without flinching, and with her

eyelids drooping down. (177; emphasis added)

Tess thus confesses to Angel, a silent confession in equivocal space that is a story of the Fall in miniature. During her confession the atmosphere around her is "lit by fire" and gives the scene a sense of being a wasteland, a wasteland resembling the fires of Hell. There is a judgment in her confession, at least to Angel's mind, referring to a "Last-Day luridness in the red-coaled glow" that reminds him of the Miltonic Serpent who, "Thus saying," "rose" (2.466) like a "large shadow" upon the "wall and ceiling." Tess's diamond necklace resembles Pandemonium's "Frontispiece of Diamond" (3.506) and it gives a "sinister wink like a toad's." To Angel, the intellectually emancipated man, Tess represents the Serpent who "Squat like a Toad, close at the ear of *Eve*" and begins the process of her deliverance into sin (4.800). Angel projects onto Tess the patriarchal sins of Woman and, as her "announcement progressed," the

> fire in the grate looked impish, *demoniacally* funny, as if it did not care in the least about her strait. The fender grinned idly, as if it, too, did not care. The light from the water-bottle was merely engaged in a chromatic problem. All material objects around announced their irresponsibility with terrible iteration. And yet *nothing had changed since the moments when he had been kissing her; or rather nothing in the substance of things. But the essence of things had changed.* (Hardy 178; emphasis added)

Tess's confession is seen by Angel as demonic even though nothing has changed since the moments when he had been kissing her. It is Tess's essence that has changed for Angel. He now sees her as the essence of Sin and Death given that, in her confession, she has probably revealed to Angel the death of Sorrow, her illegitimate child. Angel

now sees Tess as having given birth to Death and that the son is dead. Angel's death fear is pushed to the forefront of his consciousness and his patriarchal attitude toward Tess represents a screen against death. He now sees Tess not as a Goddess but as Death incarnate and, as a result, cannot find his way clear to forgive her because of his death fear. As a trace of the Goddess, however, Tess says to Angel,

> *"I have forgiven you for the same."* And as he did not answer her she said again; "forgive me, as you are forgiven. *I* forgive *you*, Angel."
>
> "You,—yes, you do."
>
> "But you do not forgive me?"
>
> "O Tess, *forgiveness does not apply to the case. You were one person: now you are another. My God—how can forgiveness meet such a grotesque—prestidigitation as that!"*
>
> He paused, contemplating this definition; then suddenly *broke into horrible laughter—as unnatural and ghastly as a laugh in hell.* (179; emphasis added)

Although Tess forgives Angel for his sexual transgression he cannot do the same for Tess. For Angel, forgiveness does not apply to Tess's case because he sees her as having perpetrated a grotesque, magical trick upon him that is worthy of a witch as suggested in *The Malleus Maleficarum*. Angel pleads to his "God" as a patriarchal defense against Tess yet, suddenly, he breaks into horrible laughter as unnatural and ghastly as a laugh from hell. At this point in the text Angel "becomes the character . . . who is rhetorically identified with Satan" (Stave 110). Hardy clearly identifies Angel with Milton's Satan by

depicting him as "fiendishly" whispering "heterodox ideas" into "the eminently righteous" Mercy Chant's ear (110).

In a conversation with Mercy Chant about his thoughts of going to Brazil to experience the nature of farming the topic turns to religion. When Angel suggests that a "cloister" would be preferable to "existence," Mercy says,

> "A cloister! O Angel Clare!"
>
> "Well?"
>
> "Why—you wicked man, a cloister implies a monk; and a monk Roman Catholicism!"
>
> "And Roman Catholicism sin, and sin damnation. Thou art in a parlous state, Angel Clare!"
>
> "*I* glory in my Protestantism," she said severely.
>
> Then Clare, thrown by sheer misery into one of the *demoniacal* moods in which a man does despite to his true principles, called her close to him, and *fiendishly whispered in her ear the most heterodox ideas he could think of*. His momentary laughter at the horror which appeared on her fair face ceased when it merged in pain and anxiety for his welfare.
>
> "Dear Mercy," he said; "you must forgive me! I think I am going crazy!" (Hardy 209; emphasis added)

Angel, with his whispering of heterodox ideas into the ear of Mercy Chant, becomes "demonaically" *one* with Alec d'Urberville. At this point in the novel both Alec and Angel represent the "totality" of the "patriarchal dictum that women are somehow at fault, tainted, for being sexual beings" (Stave 110). As sexual beings, women, at least as

far as Alec and Angel are concerned, are responsible for bringing Sin and Death into the world. As a result of this patriarchal belief Angel's death fear prompts him to dream, on his wedding night, of resurrection, a resurrection achieved by way of the fallen Tess. Angel believes that Tess's spirit "can save him from death" (Mitchell, "Narcissism" 7). Angel, without consciously realizing it, *knows* that Tess, as Goddess, represents a continuation of Life and, therefore, he must symbolically murder her in order to rid himself of her and her divine nature. Tess's forgiveness represents for Angel a Christ-like essence in which she signifies the supernaturalness of Christ's death and resurrection. In the Goddess's death and possible resurrection Angel/patriarchal man sees defeat, a defeat in which the archive is jeopardized. Angel must, therefore, symbolically (unconsciously) murder Tess so that he can free himself from the penalty of death (6). By symbolically murdering Tess Angel "takes on the lustral power of Tess's spirit" and is thus resurrected (7). In order to accomplish this symbolic murder and achieve resurrection Angel demonically dreams that he, like Satan, is directing Tess's/Eve's fate. During his dream Angel sleepwalks into Tess's "upper chamber" and "crossed the stream of moonlight" to her bedside and, bending over her, murmured, "Dead; dead; dead!" (193). This unconscious statement by Angel is a mirroring of Satan's whispering, "Squat like a toad," into Eve's ear and:

> Assaying by his Devilish art to reach
> The Organs of her Fancy, and with them forge
> Illusions as he list, Phantasms and Dreams;
> Or if, inspiring venom, he might taint
> Th' animal spirits that from pure blood arise

Like gentle breaths from Rivers pure, thence raise

At least distemper'd, discontented thoughts,

Vain hopes, vain aims, inordinate desires

Blown up with high conceits engend'ring pride. (4.800-9)

Angel unconsciously mirrors Satan in order to compromise Tess's "sexual instinct" (Mitchell, "Narcissism" 7). His subconscious intent is to further project onto Tess/Woman the "taint" of "Th' animal spirits" that represents for him the eternal Life of the Goddess. This belief is anathema to Angel and he therefore must "murder" Tess to realize his patriarchal wish for resurrection, an unconscious resurrection by which he takes on the power of the Goddess. To achieve this "unblocking" power (Mitchell, "Narcissism" 7) Angel, in his dream state,

enclosed her in his arms, and rolled her in the sheet as in a shroud. Then lifting her from the bed with as much respect as one would show a dead body, he carried her across the room, murmuring, " My poor poor Tess, my dearest darling Tess! So sweet, so good, so true!" (Hardy 193-4)

Prior to his dream Angel sees Tess as looking "absolutely pure. Nature, in her *fantastic trickery*, had set such a seal of maidenhood upon Tess's countenance that he gazed at her with a *stupefied air*" (186; emphasis added). Angel, in his death fear, mimics Satan's thoughts of Eve, dreaming:

What pleasing seem'd, for her now pleases more,

She most, and in her look sums all Delight.

Such Pleasure took the Serpent to behold

This Flow'ry Plat, the sweet recess of *Eve*

> Thus early, thus alone; her Heav'nly form
> Angelic, but more soft, and Feminine,
> Her graceful Innocence, her every Air
> Of gesture or least action overaw'd
> His Malice, and with rapine sweet bereav'd
> His fierceness of the fierce intent it brought:
> That space the evil one abstracted stood
> From his own evil, and for the time remain'd
> *Stupidly good*, of enmity disarm'd. . . . (9.454-65; emphasis added)

Tess's acceptance of death, as illustrated in her retroactive mirror stage, is unconsciously seen by Angel (seen in the form of the Goddess) as a "fantastic trickery" that the archive cannot withstand. Therefore, Angel, in his unconscious dream state, looks upon Tess with an enmity/hatred that resembles Satan's viewing Eve "Stupidly good," an enmity/hatred that he must allay by means of symbolically murdering Tess in order to achieve a resurrection opposite to that of the Goddess. Angel must somehow achieve resurrection through the Goddess so that the Goddess's power is diminished and the archive/Miltonic command remains intact. To achieve this patriarchal resurrection Angel "encoffins" the Goddess's "sexual instinct" by carrying her to a

> plantation which formed the Abby grounds, and taking a new hold of her he went onward a few steps till they reached the ruined choir of the Abby-church. Against the north wall was the empty stone coffin of an abbot, in which . . . [Angel] Clare carefully laid Tess. Having kissed her lips a second time he breathed deeply, *as if a greatly desired end were attained*.

> *Clare then lay down on the ground alongside*, when he immediately fell into the deep dead slumber of exhaustion, and remained motionless as a log. The spurt of mental excitement which had produced the effort was now over. (Hardy 195; emphasis added)

Unconsciously, Angel's desire is attained, an attainment in desire that represents resurrection and an acquiring of the Goddess's power. Angel lays down beside Tess in order to achieve, through his symbolic murder of her, the Goddess's lustral power. However, immediately after her symbolic murder, Tess sits up in the coffin (195). As the *Other that knows* in the text "[s]he had heard of such deaths after sleep-walking" (195). Therefore, as Goddess, Tess understands exactly what has transpired and, thus:

> It suddenly occurred to her to try persuasion; and accordingly she *whispered in his ear*, with as much firmness and decision as she could summon: "Let us walk on, darling," at the same time taking him suggestively by the arm. To her relief he unresistingly acquiesced; her words had apparently thrown him back into his dream, which thenceforward seemed to enter on a new phase, wherein *he fancied she had risen as a spirit, and was leading him to heaven*. (196; emphasis added)

Like the Miltonic Satan, Tess, as a trace of the Goddess, turns the tables on Angel and, whispering in his ear, tries to reverse his dream in order to confirm her belief in his instinctual fondness for her (Mitchell, "Narcissism" 8). Giles Mitchell explains that Tess's belief in Angel's instinctual fondness for her is wrong. But as a trace of the Goddess Tess would instinctually attempt to confirm, through a (sub)version of the

Miltonic command (whispering in Angel's ear), her belief in Angel's unconscious fondness for her. The Goddess would naturally assume such an underlying fondness by a beloved and would try, by whatever means available (Miltonic or otherwise), to ensure that fondness. However, this strategy does not work for the Goddess/Tess because Angel's conscious remembrance of the wedding-night dream is one that, "In truth," made him feel that "he had awakened that morning from *a sleep deep as annihilation*, and, during those first few moments in which the brain, *like a Samson shaking himself*, is trying its strength, he had some dim notion of an unusual nocturnal proceeding" (Hardy 196). Angel, although he believes that Tess has granted him resurrection, denies the Goddess's power in the Miltonic remembrance that,

> So rose the *Danite* strong
> *Herculean Samson* from the Harlot-lap
> Of *Philistean Dalilah*, and wak'd
> Shorn of his strength. . . . (9.1059-62)

Angel believes that he has risen, like Milton's Samson, from Eve's "Harlot-lap" of Sin and Death. Even though he believes that he has achieved a form of resurrection, by means of Tess's "risen spirit" leading him to heaven, he nevertheless continues to think (unconsciously) that Tess is hopelessly impure and the stain of her impurity remains on him. Angel thus resolves to separate from Tess and he sends her out of his life in a vehicle he had ordered earlier. Tess sees, as the *Other that knows*, "the severity of the decree" as "deadly" for her because Angel "could regard her in no other light than that of one who had practised gross deceit upon him" (Hardy 198). This event represents another threshold in Tess's palingenesic journey and in it she sees "the beginning of the

end—the temporary end, at least, for the revelation of his tenderness by the incident of the night raised dreams of a possible future with him" (197). Tess *knows*, as Goddess, that although Angel sends her away the event is only a temporary end and that she will again see him in the future. However, this temporary end will indeed be a definite temporal end for Tess because when she meets Angel again events will occur by which the Goddess will sacrifice herself to mythic time and successfully redeem Eve. Nevertheless, before this sacrifice can occur Tess's palingenesic journey must continue.

Tess again enters onto the road of trials and travels to Flintcomb-Ash to find outdoor work. Angel, on the other hand, has traveled to Brazil where he hopes to continue his agricultural enterprises. However, Tess, arriving at Flintcomb-Ash, *knows* that "hither she was doomed to come" (221). The environment around Tess has now turned to one of doom and Nature appears to surround the Goddess with representations of patriarchal power. In the swede-fields in which Tess and her fellow workers are "set hacking" with a "hooked fork," they are surrounded by "phallic shapes" (223). Nature has turned on the Goddess and Tess "slaved in the morning frosts and in the afternoon rains" (225). Nevertheless, Tess displays the patience of the Goddess, "that blending of moral courage with physical timidity," a patience that "was now no longer a minor feature in Mrs Angel Clare; and it sustained her" (223). The Goddess will need her patience because it is in this setting that she again encounters Alec d'Urberville. Entering the village Tess discovers Alec preaching the Gospel in a barn. Alec has converted to Christianity and has ostensibly changed his previous wicked ways. Tess is appalled at Alec's conversion and

> this change in their relative platforms. He who had wrought her undoing

> was now on the side of the spirit, *while she remained unregenerate*. And, as in the legend, it had resulted that her Cyprian image had suddenly appeared upon his altar, whereby the fire of the priest had been well-nigh extinguished. (240; emphasis added)

Alec's miraculous conversion in the novel "functions to establish a parallel between Alec and Angel," who does a similar about face after Tess's confession. Angel, who at this time is in Brazil, is "lying ill of fever . . . having been drenched with thunderstorms and persecuted by other hardships" (215). Alec now appears to Tess as a "representative of the spirit of God" while Angel has taken on the attributes of Death. Tess is contemptuous of Alec's conversion, yet he says to her, "No amount of contempt that you can pour upon me, Tess, will equal what I have poured upon myself—*the old Adam*, of my former years" (241; emphasis added). Alec associates himself with Adam while, in his former years, he was clearly representative of the Miltonic Satan. This role reversal is one that he will not be able to sustain. When Alec and Tess come upon a stone pillar called "Cross-in-Hand," Alec explains that the relic "was once a Holy Cross" (243-4). At this point Alec's Satanic side re-emerges in his *fear* of Tess/Goddess, saying:

> "Relics are not in my creed; but *I fear you at moments*—far more than you need fear me at present; and *to lessen my fear*, put your hand upon that stone hand, and swear that *you will never tempt me—by your charms or ways*."
>
> "Good God—how can you ask what is so unnecessary! All that is furthest from my thought."
>
> "Yes—but swear it."

> Tess, half frightened, gave way to his importunity, placed her hand upon the stone, and swore. (244; emphasis added)

Alec, whose *essence* still resides in the shadow of Death, fears the Goddess and makes her swear on the relic that she will never tempt him again by her charms or ways. This event, however, is only a ruse used by Alec's Shadow Self, his Satanic Self, to trick the Goddess into swearing an oath to Death, a Death that the Shadow *hopes* will reinforce the command. The Goddess, on the other hand, is only partially fooled by the ruse. Once Tess parts company with Alec after having sworn her oath to the Shadow, she meets a solitary shepherd along the road. Curious about the relic she has just sworn an oath to, she asks the shepherd:

> "What is the meaning of that old stone I have passed? . . ." "Was it ever a Holy Cross?"
>
> "Cross—no; 'twer not a cross. 'Tis a *thing of ill-omen*, miss. It was put up in wuld times by the relations of a malefactor who was tortured there by nailing his hand to a post, and afterwards hung. The bones lie underneath. They say *he sold his soul to the devil*, and that he walks at times."
>
> She felt the *petite mort* at this unexpectedly gruesome information, and left the solitary man behind her. (245; emphasis added)

Tess, realizing that she may have played into the Shadow's hand, feels the *petite mort* (the little shudder of death). The Goddess *knows* that the end of her palingenesic journey is almost over and that her death is imminent. However, the Goddess/Tess is determined, by way of her palingenesic journey, to make her death one that is beneficial to the Saying

in the mythic narrative (and therefore to culture) and not one that is beneficial to the Miltonic command. Her clear resolve to accept her death—a death that she *knows* through her mirror stage—occurs when Alec's "figure darkened the window" of her cottage after he has confronted her about Angel while she worked in the fields (251). Alec confronts her again, saying:

> "Tess, my girl, *I was on the way to, at least, social salvation* till I saw you again." He smiled, shaking her as if she were a child. "And why then have you *tempted me*? I was firm as a man could be till I saw those eyes and that mouth again—surely there never was such *a madding mouth since Eve's*." His voice sank, and *a hot archness shot from his own black eyes*. "You temptress, Tess; you dear *damned witch* of Babylon—I could not resist you as soon as I met you again!" (254)

Tess's will to accept her palingenesic death resides in her awareness, as Goddess, that Alec represents the Shadow of all that she is forbidden to believe. Tess *knows* that she is forbidden to believe that "the great Power who moves the world would [ever] alter his plans on [her] account" (251). As a trace-of-the-Goddess-in-the-text Tess unconsciously realizes that she, who is genealogically related to Eve, is again being confronted by the Serpent. The Goddess understands that the patriarchy sees her as a "temptress" and that Alec represents a part of that patriarchal "society" that fears her, a Shadow part that was on "the way to, at least, social salvation." Thus Tess is condemned by the Serpent as a witch and she *knows* that she is a "temptress" that is feared by both the Serpent and Adamic man, i.e., Angel Clare; although, Angel, too, has taken on a form of the Shadow. However, Alec's fear of Tess, particularly his never seeing "such a

madding mouth since Eve's," concentrically relates to the Goddess the Miltonic unconsciousness wherein the Serpent sees Eve in the Garden a second time and thinks, just prior to her Fall:

> Such Pleasure took the Serpent to behold
> This Flow'ry Plat, the sweet recess of *Eve*
> Thus early, thus alone; her Heav'nly form
> Angelic, but more soft, and Feminine,
> Her graceful Innocence, her every Air
> Of gesture or least action overaw'd
> His Malice, and with rapine sweet bereav'd
> His fierceness of the fierce intent it brought:
> That space the Evil one abstracted stood
> From his own evil, and for the time remain'd
> Stupidly good, of enmity disarm'd,
> Of guile, of hate, of envy, of revenge;
> But the hot Hell that always in him burns,
> Though in mid Heav'n, soon ended his delight,
> And tortures him now more, the more he sees
> Of pleasure not for him ordain'd; then soon
> Fierce hate he recollects, and all his thoughts
> Of mischief, gratulating, thus excites. (9.455-72)

Alec cannot resist Tess because, as a Shadow of the Serpent, he sees the pleasure in her "graceful Innocence." For a time, as a convert, Alec stood "abstracted" from "his own

evil"; however, once he again encounters Tess, "the hot Hell that always in him burns" comes to the forefront of his consciousness and he sees a "pleasure not for him ordained." Alec recollects "Fierce hate" toward Tess and "a hot *archness* shot [at her] from his own black eyes." Alec wants to again control the Goddess/Eve, thus reasserting patriarchal control of Woman as dictated by the Miltonic command. As a trace of the Goddess, Tess senses this patriarchal desire in Alec and she rises to the challenge.

Tess travels the road of trials again, this time she returns to her home in Marlott. Upon her return to Marlott, Tess awakens the next morning to find that "many gardens and allotments of the village had already received their spring tillage; but the garden and allotment of the Durbyfields were behindhand" (Hardy 273). In a few days Tess takes over the "allotment-plot which they rented in a field a couple of hundred yards out of the village" (273). One evening, while she and her sister Liza-Lu were burning couch-grass and cabbage-stalks, the

> fires began to light up the allotments fitfully, their outlines appearing and disappearing under the *dense smoke* as wafted by the wind. *When a fire glowed, banks of smoke blown level along the ground would themselves become illuminated to an opaque lustre*, screening the workpeople form one another; *and the meaning of the "pillar of a cloud," which was a wall by day and a light by night, could be understood*. (273; emphasis added)

Although the fires in the allotment-plots resemble the "opaque lustre" of the fires of Hell, the "pillar of a cloud" from Exodus 13.21 *could be understood* only as far as the other "workpeople" are concerned. Nature and the Shadow of Alec d'Urberville have forced

onto Tess a more hellish shape whereby she resembles more a demon in hell than a follower of a "forgiving" *patriarchal* God leading her out of slavery and into redemption. Tess's demonic appearance is described in a passage where she labors over a particular couch-burning plot. Tess has sent Liza-Lu home and:

> It was on one of the couch-burning plots that she laboured with *her fork*, its *four shining prongs* resounding against the stones and dry clods in little clicks. *Sometimes she was completely involved in the smoke of her fire*; then it would leave her figure free. Irradiated by the brassy glare from the heap. She was oddly dressed to-night, and presented a somewhat staring aspect, her attire being a gown bleached by many washings, with a short black jacket over it, *the effect of the whole being that of a wedding and a funeral guest in one*. (274; emphasis added)

This passage effectively describes the patriarchal ideal of woman as the bringer of Sin and Death into the world. Tess, as Goddess, is seen working the couch-burning plots with a shining four-pronged fork, a hellish demon sometimes completely involved in the smoke of her own fire. At once she seems to be both the bride and the corpse laboring amongst the fires of Hell. Patriarchally, this representation of Tess is correct in that when a particular fire flares up, "she beheld the face of d'Urberville" (274). Alec d'Urberville appears among the hellish fires of the couch-burning plots like the countenance of Satan. Alec lets out a "low long laugh" and:

> "If I were inclined to joke I should say, How much this seems like Paradise!" he remarked, whimsically looking at her with an inclined head.
>
> "What do you say?" [Tess] weakly asked.

> "A jester might say this is just like Paradise. You are Eve, and I am the old other one, come to tempt you in the disguise of an inferior animal. *I used to be quite up in that scene of Milton's* when I was theological. (275; emphasis added)

For Alec this scene would seem like Paradise given that in *Paradise Lost* Satan says, "Better to reign in Hell, than serve in Heav'n" (1.263). Alec is the ultimate jester, the Arch-Fiend, clearly identifying himself to Tess as the Miltonic "other one." Alec claims that he is "quite up *in* that scene of Milton's," and clearly he is narratively associated with the scene:

> Empress, the way is ready, and not long,
> Beyond a row of Myrtles, on a Flat,
> Fast by a Fountain, one small Thicket past
> Of blowing Myrrh and balm; if thou accept
> My conduct, I can bring the thither soon.
> Lead then, said *Eve*. (9.626-31)

Tess, as Goddess, has already eaten of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, but she is ready to have Alec *lead* her to a palingenesic liaison. She goes with Alec to Sandbourne where she, in effect, becomes his "wife." At this time, however, Angel has returned to Emminster from Brazil and:

> You could see the skeleton behind the man, and almost the ghost behind the skeleton. He matched Crivelli's dead *Christus*. His sunken eye-pits were of morbid hue, and the light in his eyes had waned. The angular hollows and lines of his aged ancestors had succeeded to their reign in his

face twenty years before their time. (Hardy 290)

Angel Clare has become the image of Death. You could see the skeleton behind the man, a man who, for all intents and purposes, has returned to England because he *believes* that he still loves Tess. Nevertheless, as an image of Death, Angel represents the patriarchal judgment that Woman's sexuality is Death incarnate. Angel therefore mirrors Death and, by returning to England, seeks out Tess in order to lessen his own death fear. He catches up to Tess in Sandbourne while she is living with Alec and asks "Can you forgive me for going away?" (298). Tess, in a moment of *knowledge* in the Other, states, "It is too late!" (298). Alec has won Tess back, although, as a trace of the Goddess, she *knows* what has to be done. In order to free the Goddess from the Miltonic command, Tess must kill the man who *was* her "master once" (261) and, in so doing, she will free herself and Angel from that command. Tess's fear/courage, as Goddess, is reflected in her statement to Alec that,

> "he is dying—he looks as if he is dying. . . . . [*sic*] and my sin will kill him and not kill me! . . . O you have torn my life all in pieces. . . . [*sic*] made me be what I prayed you in pity not to make me be again! . . . My own true husband will never never—O God—I can't bear this! I cannot!" (301)

Tess *knows* that Angel, as a dormant recipient of the Saying, must be saved in order to subvert the Miltonic command. She sees the skeleton behind the command, the death that would continue to reside in mankind/the mythic narrative if nothing were to be done. *Knowing* that death resides in Angel as a remembrance of the patriarchy, Tess resolves to kill the Shadow of Death as represented by Alec d'Urberville, her former master.

Textually, Tess kills Alec in equivocal space. The reader is only made aware of the "scarlet blot" on the "oblong white ceiling" after Tess has killed Alec (301). The Goddess has thrust a knife into the heart of Alec d'Urberville, a phallic blade thrust into the core of the patriarchy striking at the very heart of the Miltonic command. By thrusting the "phallus" into the heart of Alec d'Urberville, Tess has taken the patriarchal Name-of-the-Father *away* from the Serpent/Adamic man and thrust it into the patriarchal Logos, or the archive. The trace of the Goddess has killed, by way of the phallus, the archival notion that Woman is the bringer of Sin and Death into the world. However, she must, yet again, reinforce this redemptive statement to the world by means of a palingenesic death. Tess must once more walk the road of trials in order to achieve her goal of redemption in the palingenesic journey. After having killed Alec, Tess catches up with Angel on the road of trials and says:

> "I have done it—I don't know how, . . ." "*Still, I owed it to you, and to myself, Angel.* I feared long ago, when I struck him on the mouth with my glove, that I might do it some day for the trap he set for me in my simple youth, and his wrong to you through me. *He has come between us and ruined us, and now he can never do it any more.* . . . But I don't blame you; only *Angel, will you forgive me my sin against you, now I have killed him*? I thought as I ran along that you would be sure to forgive me now I have done that. It came to me as a shining light that I should get you back that way. I could not bear the loss of you any longer—you don't know how entirely I was unable to bear your not loving me. Say you do now, dear dear husband: say you do, now I have killed

him." (303-4; emphasis added)

Tess, as a trace of the Goddess, has arrived close to the nadir of her palingenesic journey. She has killed patriarchal/Miltonic man by way of the knife, as phallus, again appropriating the Name-of-the-Father. Tess *knows* that she owes it to herself, to the mythic narrative, and to Angel to eliminate the Shadow (Alec) because he has come between the Goddess and her Nature/sexuality. The Goddess's/Eve's Nature was/is instinctual sexuality. Tess therefore endeavors to reclaim a "portion" of the Goddess's Nature by way of a parodic sexual union with Angel Clare at Bramhurst Court. Her permanent reacquisition of the Goddess's Nature occurs later when she and Angel go to Stonehenge. After her parodic sexual union with Angel, the temporal agent by which the Goddess will leave her *earthly* boon to culture, they emerge from Bramhurst Court after "five days have slipped by" (307). Essentially, then, the Goddess emerges from her reaffirmation of instinctual sexuality on the sixth day, reminiscent of the creation in Genesis. The Goddess has again appropriated the very essence of the archive in order to achieve her ultimate goal. Although it appears that Angel leads Tess to certain capture at Stonehenge in order to "sacrifice her to his death fear," he is now clearly in the time and hour of the Goddess in which she will realize her goal of redemption in her dimension of accomplishment (Mitchell 11). Tess, through her parodic sexual union with Angel, has achieved a form of transference by which Angel's death fear now resides in her, as Goddess. Unconsciously Angel no longer fears Death and, as a result, takes Tess to Stonehenge in order to obtain some form of "pardon" from the Goddess during her time and hour *in the Other*. The unconsciousness of Angel's realization of the supernaturalness in Tess is reflected in the Stonehenge event when he perceives the

ancient monument as a "very Temple to the Winds" (Hardy 310). Tess then flings herself upon an oblong slab as if laying down on an altar to be sacrificed. At this point Tess tells Angel that she does not want to go any further and that "I like very much to be here" (310). The Goddess has completed her road of trials and has arrived at the return threshold whereby she will sacrifice herself. Tess, by assuming the sacrificial altar, achieves a higher level of divination; in essence, she achieves a complete apotheosis. The Goddess falls asleep on the sacrificial altar (symbolic of a form of death) and while Angel and the local constabulary (who have come to arrest Tess for "murdering" Alec) wait for her to awaken. As morning arrives the "light grew strong and a ray shone upon her unconscious form, peering under her eyelids and waking her" (312). The awakening of Tess by a ray of the rising sun is a "consummation" that results in the Goddess's "self-sacrifice" (Stave 106). Stave believes that Tess's self-sacrifice (read in the context of myth) becomes a death that is "terrifying" since "she who is the bearer of life, the keeper of the seed, the goddess . . . is lost to the world and with her goes the possibility of renewal" (106). But it is precisely the possibility of renewal that Tess, the Goddess, is trying to achieve by her self-sacrifice. Nature is attempting to help the Goddess achieve this renewal because the divine ray igniting the light of the Goddess's eyes "symbolizes the communication of divine energy to the womb of the world. . . . Through the sun door the circulation of energy is continuous" (Campbell, *Hero* 42). Mythically, then, Tess sacrifices herself to the continuous circulation of energy in the time and hour of the Other and says, "I am ready" (Hardy 313). Tess, in her readiness, gives herself to Death in order to renew the Saying of the Goddess that has been lost in the archive. By her hanging at Wintoncester Tess attains the time and hour of the Other, a time and hour that

allows her to ascend into the continuous circulation of alterity wherein the *otherwise than being* resides. As the "black flag" is raised to signify Tess's death, the Goddess, who has completed all the trials necessary to realize the hero(ine's) palingenesic journey, achieves redemption not only for herself but for the mythic intertext in which she reinstates the ancient Saying in the Said that has gone unsaid since the Miltonic command. Tess is a palingenesic hero(ine) who has crossed the return threshold and will bring a boon to culture (and the intertext/sociolect) that will ultimately subvert the Miltonic command that "states" Woman is the bringer of Sin and Death into the world. Tess's death is a *true self-sacrifice*, a Christ-like self-sacrifice, that allows her to successfully redeem Eve. Only a Woman/Goddess can redeem Eve through a Christ-like self-sacrifice in Death so that her redemption *is not mediated by a male*. Clearly Hardy, as a recognized mythographer, has used *Paradise Lost* as a major source for *Tess* and has consciously attempted to rescind the Miltonic command.

Tess's Christ-like *self-sacrifice* as Goddess has successfully shifted the sex of the savior which allows *her* to redeem Eve without that redemption being mediated by a male. Eve's redemption by way of Tess is, therefore, successful, complete, and incontrovertible. As a result, then, Yoder's contention that Richardson's Clarissa plays the role of Christ and thus redeems Eve lacks authority. Clarissa's death is not a self-sacrifice on her part but a *will to death* that is a *will to power*. Her *will to power* is not a self-sacrifice for the redemption of anyone but herself. To simply *will* oneself to death, as Clarissa does, achieves nothing but a temporal power over those people that she has selfishly left behind. A redemption of Eve by means of Clarissa's *will to power* simply does not obtain. Tess, on the other hand, clearly elects to sacrifice herself *knowing* that

her death will bring some form of beneficial result to the patriarchal world she will be leaving behind. What Tess, as Goddess, leaves behind is a palingenesic boon to culture that redeems the genealogic lineage of the Goddess in the mythic narrative. She has palingenesically undergone the supreme ordeal, the hero(ine's) deferential self-sacrifice toward bringing a beneficial boon to culture. The raising of the black flag signifying Tess's death represents that boon. At that moment, Tess enters an expansion of (un)consciousness that allows her to be for the Other, in the Other. Tess achieves a victory for the Goddess in her dimension of accomplishment and rises in the "phoenix motif" signified by the raising of the black flag (Neumann 240). The gallows thus becomes the Goddess's tree that supplies nourishment to the world (the boon) and Tess acquires, by way of her self-sacrificial death, an *eternal existence* "born of the Feminine" (241). Tess's final palingenesic work will be that of the "return," an incorporeal eternal return that will forever subvert the Miltonic command and break the silence of the unsaid Saying in the Said that is the archive. As a result, Tess will enter the unconsciousness of the intertext and will narrate the mythic narrative (even her own narrative in *Tess*) as a Supernatural narrator in mythic time that, as an *otherwise than being*, successfully obtains the nonsite of alterity in the incessantly sliding symbolic orders of concentricity where the Saying may be acquired and ultimately "Said." As a Supernatural narrator, Tess will break the silence of the Goddess and narrate the unsaid story that has been obliterated in the patriarchal narratives "secured" in the archive. The Goddess/Supernatural narrator (Tess) will therefore gain relative control mythic time, control the mythic narrative, and restore Woman/Eve (Asherah) to her rightful place in history as the original deity to which culture recognized as a giver of Life, and not Death.

CHAPTER 4

RETROACTIVITY AND THE SUPERNATURAL NARRATOR

Hardy scholars generally agree that the narrative in *Tess* is the narrative of Thomas Hardy. Janet Freeman says in her essay "Ways of Looking at Tess," that "Hardy tells her story," which supports classic criticism of Hardy's novel's and their narratives as a whole (311). There is also agreement among Hardy scholars that in Hardy's narratives there exists an "editorial Hardy" and a "dramatic Hardy," two sides of the same narrative voice that are often in contradiction with one another (Mitchell, "Narcissism" 6). Classic and contemporary interpretations of Tess's death in the novel continue to read that ending as Angel having led Tess to her sacrifice on the gallows for the purpose of punishing her for what is her instinctual sexuality. Tess is also seen as somehow complicit in her own death due to a need on her part to exonerate herself (in Angel's eyes) for that instinctual sexuality. However, given Hardy's obvious use of *Paradise Lost* as a source for the novel in what is clearly a mythographic attempt to challenge the Miltonic command, the question then becomes just what exactly does Tess's death mean?

If Tess's self-sacrifice is indeed a form of confession in order to gain Angel's forgiveness, does she, by that "complicity," acquiesce to the Miltonic command that implicates Woman as the bringer of Sin and Death into the world? Does the Miltonic "indictment" obtain in the "statement" that Tess makes by sacrificing herself in the text? As I have previously indicated, it is my contention that Tess's self-sacrifice on the altar at Stonehenge and her resulting death are both palingenesic accomplishments intended to

subvert the Miltonic command in order to effect a successful redemption of the Goddess/Eve. By her self-sacrifice Tess accepts death not as the representation of an indictment of the Goddess's/Woman's instinctual sexuality but as an event by which she can transcend the Miltonic command and redeem Eve in mythic time. Tess may see the altar at Stonehenge as a representation of the Miltonic altar, however, "altar can easily be associated with alter" (Taylor xxix). Because altar can mean "the female pudendum," both altar and alter are "sexually suggestive" (xxviii). To alter means both "*to make otherwise* or different" and "*to become otherwise*, to undergo some change in character or appearance" such as altered states of consciousness (xxviii; emphasis added). Tess's self-sacrifice on the altar at Stonehenge is very sexually suggestive given that her instinctual sexuality is ultimately the agent of her death. Tess's death can then be described as a form of altarity whereby she becomes an *otherwise than being* in the unconsciousness of the mythic narrative. Altarity thus folds into alterity. Tess enters the intertext by way of altarity and becomes an *otherwise than being* who can affect alterity in narrative concentricity in order to redeem the Goddess/Eve. As an *otherwise than being* in the altarity of narrative concentricity Tess becomes a Supernatural narrator in the Other that can appropriate and narrate the unsaid Saying of the Goddess in the archive.

In order to acquire the Supernatural narrator in the altarity of narrative concentricity, the reader must execute a Riffaterrean retroactive reading of Tess's death at the end of the novel to determine what narrative "truth" obtains in the Goddess's Saying. To determine Tess's supernatural narration involves a retroactive reading in which the reader performs "a first reading stage" that "goes on from beginning to the end of the text. . . . This first *heuristic reading* is also where the first interpretation takes

place, since it is during this reading that *meaning* is apprehended" (Riffaterre, *Semiotics of Poetry* 5). An effective first, or heuristic, reading by the reader will also require literary competence involving the reader's "familiarity with descriptive systems, with themes, with his society's mythologies, and above all *other texts*" (5; emphasis added). The intertextual recognition by the reader of descriptive systems, with themes, and with society's mythologies in a given text will initiate a "second stage" or retroactive reading, which is "the time for a second interpretation" (5). The reader's second interpretation is the "truly hermeneutic reading," and

> [t]he maximal effect of retroactive reading, the climax of its function as generator of significance, naturally comes at the end of the [text]; [mytho]poeticalness is thus a function coextensive with the text, linked to a limited realization of discourse, bounded by clausula *and* beginning (which in retrospect we perceive as related). This is why, whereas units of meaning may be words or phrases or sentences, *the unit of significance is the text*. To discover the significance at last, the reader must surmount the mimesis hurdle [the first reading]: in fact this hurdle is essential to the reader's change of mind. (5-6)

By performing a retroactive reading of *Tess*, the reader can examine the mythological/Miltonic themes in Hardy's narrative to determine what narrative "truth" may lie within its textual self-consciousness and narrative, symbolic orders (systems). Realizing, retroactively, that the narrative in *Tess* more fully employs the Edenic Fall as a theme and, thus, a desire in the text to confront the Miltonic indictment of Eve, the reader can then focus on any number of narrative examples to acquire the "truth" in the novel's

narrative structures. An example of a retroactively acquired narrative segment that the reader might consider for the reinterpretation of *Tess* can be seen in the supernaturalness of the Tessian narrative:

> She thought, without exactly wording the thought, how strange and *godlike* was a *composer's power*, who *from the grave* could lead through sequences of emotion, which he alone had felt at first, a girl like her who had never heard of his name, and never would have a clue to his personality. (Hardy 66; emphasis added)

In this segment of the novel's text Tess is aware of, or *knows*, the power of a composer's narrative, a narrative that can emanate with influential force from beyond death. Tess's knowledge of a godlike narrative force that can be brought to bear on the reader (and narrative concentricity) from beyond death is also in agreement with J. Hillis Miller's interpretation of *Tess*. Miller states that the novel "has a strange and godlike power to lead its readers through some version of the sequences of emotion for which it provides the notation" (146). This "strange and godlike power" in *Tess* attains "that intrusion of a commentary [in the novel] which belongs to another order of discourse" (Van Ghent 197). The "[an]other order of discourse" identified by Dorothy Van Ghent is the discourse of the Other in which the *otherwise than being* narrates in the altarity of narrative concentricity. The reader might then determine that Tess's "beyond the grave event" represents a spiritual transfiguration (an initial step toward Tess's narrative mastery of two worlds, the temporal and the mythic), one that is a significant element in her eventual elevation, through death, into *an otherwise than being* in altarity, thus clearly identifying Tess as the *Other that knows* early in the text. The reader, as other,

then reads that Tess, the *Other that knows*, "reads" in the *knowledge* of her "beyond the grave event," a knowledge that allows her, and the reader, to attain the "idea [or supernatural agency] . . . to shun mankind—or rather the cold accretion called the world, which, so terrible in the mass, is so unformidable, even pitiable, in its units" (Hardy 66). The reader thus reads that Tess is the Other in the text, is the text, and that she is as text the *Other that knows*; and, "it is that knowledge in the Other, of the Other, which must be read" and appropriated from the Other in order to mitigate our lack of knowledge in the "truth" of the narrative in *Tess*. Therefore, as the *Other that knows*, Tess is the novel's "true/truth" narrator, the Supernatural narrator that knows and is telling the reader of her appropriation *into herself* of the Hardyan narrative, the narrative as a "transumption" of archival discourse and the Miltonic command (Bloom, *A Map of Misreading* 138).

However, for the reader, as other, to read Tess as the *Other that knows* and, as a result, the Supernatural narrator, the reader must read the *otherwise than being* that Tess achieves in her sacrificial death, as text. Once the reader reads the death of Tess as the achievement of an *otherwise than being* in the altarity of narrative concentricity, the text becomes endowed with the spirit of Tess as a supernatural presence. Tess, then, retroactively enters narrative concentricity and inhabits the spaces of altarity in the incessantly sliding symbolic orders of narrativity. She becomes the Supernatural narrator of the mythic narrative, speaking for the Great Goddess, and re-enters Hardy's text from its very beginning and displaces Hardy as the novel's narrative authority. Reading retroactively, then, the reader immediately reads the *otherwise than being*, the Supernatural narrator, as "an elderly parson astride on a *grey mare* [Death], who, as he strode, hummed a *wandering tune* [the palingenesic quest]" (Hardy 3). As the

Supernatural narrator Tess has risen from her sacrificial death as an incorporeal inhabitant of narrative concentricity and is master of both worlds, the natural and the supernatural, just as the Goddess is meant to be. Tess, having entered the altarity of the incessantly sliding symbolic orders of narrative concentricity, supplants herself as Other in the symbol of the "parson astride on a grey mare" who represents "the past versus the future" astride the ashes of Death (Chetwynd 154). The text in the novel *is*, therefore, immediately endowed with the symbolic authority for Tess as Other in the form of the Supernatural narrator and, as "resurrection," nullifies the critical controversy over the purity Hardy assigns to Tess (as Woman) in the title of his novel. As the Supernatural narrator in narrative concentricity Tess achieves *pure* spirituality in the *otherwise than being* by her self-sacrificial death into pure goddesshood. Tess powerfully appropriates the self-consciousness of narrative concentricity as a *pure form* of Goddess and narrates *Tess* from the altarity of the *otherwise than being* as the mythic narrative's Supernatural narrator. The novel begins:

> On an evening in the latter part of May a middle-aged man was walking homeward from Shaston to the village of Marlott, in the adjoining Vale of Blackmore or Blackmoor. The pair of legs that carried him were rickety, and there was a bias in his gait which inclined him somewhat to the left of a straight line. . . . Presently he was met by an elderly parson astride on a grey mare, who, as he rode, hummed a wandering tune. (Hardy 1)

The Supernatural narrator's presence becomes problematic in that the narration is in third person omniscient. This third person omniscient narration of the Supernatural

narrator can be attributed to the majesty attained by Tess in her *otherwise than being* as pure Goddess. In essence, the Supernatural narrator, in her purity as *otherwise than being*, is using the royal "we." This majesty attained by the Supernatural narrator extends to the Other, as text, and would naturally extent to the Other's narrative "voice," thus endowing the "supplementarity" of the third person narrative with symbolic authority over that of the presumed necessity for a first person narrative as it might apply to Tess's appropriation of the text (Derrida, *Of Grammatology* 136). The authority for such a supernatural reading of *Tess* stems from a retroactive reading in which the reader interprets the Supernatural narrator's presence by examining "rhetorical transformation[s] of the narrative into figurative discourse[s] or from the situational analogies between the writer's inventions and representations of recognized reality" in the text (Riffaterre, *Fictional Truth* 1-2). The rhetorical transformations in *Tess* that represent the novel's own recognized reality are stunning in their "referential sequentiality," which provides the narrative with ever increasing narrative derivations that continue to extend its symbolic systems further and further into a supernatural otherness (127). The first rhetorical transformation in the narrative that extends the novel into the referential sequentiality of supernatural otherness belongs to the "parson astride on a grey mare." Tess's *otherwise than being* in altarity appropriates this symbol and transforms it into one of the mare representing both the feminine libido and the ashes of Death (Chetwynd 207). Through the hero(ine's) gaining of the boon achieved in Death and represented by the raising of the black flag, she becomes a "phoenix" rising to a higher plane of existence (Neumann 240). Tess has risen from the ashes of Death and has palingenesically returned through the mythological phoenix motif (resurrection) to bring the boon of the

Goddess's Saying to the mythic narrative. Tess's return through retroactivity places her in narrative concentricity as an *otherwise than being* narrating a Feminine *libido sciendi* that will restore the purity of the Goddess and narrate a (sub)version of the Miltonic command. Tess's narration in *Tess*, as the Supernatural narrator, becomes a *libido sciendi* in otherness that she narrates from the beginning of the novel to its end.

The Supernatural narrator begins *her* narration by carrying her Feminine Saying astride a grey mare, which not only represents Death but "carrying a man in the womb" (207). The Goddess has returned and has rhetorically transformed the narrative in *Tess* into one of rebirth, a rebirth that will subvert man's patriarchal ideal of Woman as the bringer of Sin and Death into the world. Man, along with the Goddess, will be reborn into a feminized/matrilineal text that will be narrated by the Supernatural narrator in the Saying and will ultimately subvert the Miltonic command.

Tess *knows*, as the text's Supernatural narrator, that "the personal charms which [she] could boast were in main part her mother's gift, and therefore unknightly, unhistorical" (Hardy 12). The "mother's gift" is the Mother Goddess's (Tess's mother) gift of knowledge to Tess/the Supernatural narrator that she did not, and does not, reside in historical time but in mythic time. As the Supernatural narrator, then, Tess narrates her own story, both in narrative time and in mythic time, and leaves clues all along the narrative's referential sequentiality of her otherness as an *otherwise than being*. Tess's otherness in the text can be seen in the Supernatural narrator's description of Tess when she states:

> It was a thousand pities, indeed; it was impossible for even an enemy to feel otherwise on looking at Tess as she sat there, with her

> flower-like mouth and large tender eyes, neither black nor blue nor grey nor violet; rather all those shades together, and a hundred others, which could be seen if one looked into their irises—shade behind shade—tint beyond tint—around pupils that had no bottom; an almost standard woman, but for the slight incautiousness of character inherited from her race. (71)

Tess's otherness is clearly narrated by the Supernatural narrator in this passage. The Supernatural narrator describes Tess as having ethereal qualities, an *almost* standard woman yet a woman confronted by the Miltonic command that "her race" has inherited. This confrontation between the Miltonic command and Woman ("her race") is exactly what the Supernatural narrator is narrating in the unconscious Saying of the mythic narrative. In the Saying, the Supernatural narrator *knows* that

> [t]he past was past; whatever it had been it was no more at hand. Whatever its consequences, time would close over them; they would all in a few years be as if they had never been, and she [Tess] herself grassed down and forgotten. (71)

The Supernatural narrator *knows* that time will close over the consequences of the Goddess's instinctual sexuality. Although Tess will be grassed down and forgotten historically, her elevation to Supernatural narrator after her sacrificial death will cause those Miltonic consequences to be as if they had never been. Nevertheless, the Supernatural narrator continues to give clues to Tess's supernaturalness in the text's referential sequentiality. The Supernatural narrator explains that Tess

> *might have seen* what had bowed her head so profoundly—the thought

> of the world's concern at her situation—was founded on *an illusion*. She was *not an existence*, an experience, a passion, a structure of sensations, to anybody but herself. To all humankind besides Tess was only a *passing thought*. Even to friends she was no more than a frequent passing thought. If she made herself miserable the livelong night and day it was only this much to them—"Ah, she makes herself unhappy." If she tried to be cheerful, to dismiss all care, to take pleasure in the daylight, the flowers, the baby, she could only be this idea to them—"Ah, she bears it very well." Moreover, alone in a desert island would she have been wretched at what had happened to her? Not greatly. If she could have been but *just created*, to discover herself as a spouseless mother, with no experience of life except as the parent of a nameless child, would the position have caused her to despair? No, she would have taken it calmly, and found pleasure therein. *Most of the misery had been generated by her conventional aspect, and not by her innate sensations*. (71; emphasis added)

The text indicates that Tess *might have seen* what had bowed her head so profoundly. The text's "might have seen" suggests the possibility that she *has seen*, seen that her situation, as Goddess, is founded on *an illusion*, a Miltonic illusion. However, the Supernatural narrator explicitly tells the reader that Tess was *not an existence*, just a passing thought—at least to some. Tess, as Goddess, is a passing thought, even to her friends, but most of her misery was generated by her being a Woman and not by the *knowledge* of the Goddess's innate/instinctual sexuality. The Supernatural narrator

knows, as Tess, that she is narrating an existence that is *otherwise than being* and that her previous existence was founded on an illusion. The illusion that Tess's previous existence is founded on is the Miltonic illusion that the humanized Goddess, Eve, is the bringer of Sin and Death into the world. As the Supernatural narrator, narrating her own text, Tess touches on her supernaturalness, stating:

> "I don't—know about ghosts," she was saying. "But I do know that our souls can be made to go outside our bodies when we are alive."
>
> The dairyman [Angel] turned to her with his mouth full, his eyes charged with serious inquiry, and his great knife and fork (breakfasts were breakfasts here) planted erect on the table, like the beginning of a gallows. (94)

The Supernatural narrator's narration foreshadows the gallows that will ultimately lead to her self-sacrifice and the redemption of the Goddess, Eve. Angel detects the underlying message that Tess is sending, that there are supernatural forces in the world that not even he can control. She knows that if souls can be made to go outside the body when we are alive, then they will surely go outside the body in Death. The unconscious textual message Tess is sending suggests that on the gallows, the gallows Angel is foreshadowing in the supernatural narration, she will be elevated beyond/otherwise than both the Miltonic command and anything Angel can ever do to punish her for the Goddess's instinctual sexuality. Nevertheless, the Supernatural narrator continues to narrate Tess's story in an effort to demonstrate the Goddess's palingenesic journey on the road of trials. Tess asks herself before her marriage to Angel, "Why don't somebody tell

him all about me? . . .” “It is only forty miles off [Marlott]—why hasn’t it reached here? Somebody must know!” Yet nobody seemed to know; nobody told him” (138). Because “nobody told him” the Goddess decides to tell her story to Angel herself. However, first she seeks guidance from her mother, Joan Durbeyfield, who, in the text, is a strong representation of the Mother Goddess. In a letter to Tess on the subject of her story, her mother writes:

> Many a woman, some of the Highest in the Land, had a Trouble in their time; and why should you Trumpet yours when others don’t Trumpet theirs? No girl would be such a fool, specially as it is so long ago, and not your Fault at all. (150)

Tess was “[t]hus steadied by a *command* from the only person in the world who had any shadow of right to control her” (151; emphasis added). Although Tess’s mother advises her not to trumpet her “trouble” to Angel, she knows that the “trouble” is not Tess’s fault. Tess is briefly steadied by a *command* outside the Miltonic command but, *knowing* her palingenesic journey must continue, she decides to tell Angel anyway. Retroactively, Tess’s confession to Angel becomes a supernaturally narrated narrative of the Fall in miniature. The text is both intertextually and unconsciously charged with references to the Miltonic command. When Tess leans forward to confess to Angel each diamond on her neck had a sinister wink like a toad’s, suggesting Satan squat like a toad close to Eve’s ear in *Paradise Lost*. The Supernatural narrator narrates Tess’s story by intertextually referencing the Miltonic command that states Woman is the evil one in the Fall. Although Angel has had a sexual assignation of his own, he is thoroughly grounded in the Miltonic command and immediately blames Tess, as Woman, for the Sin of

sexuality. The Supernatural narrator's intention in this narration is to bring home the clear double standard that exists in history that states Woman is somehow the only one to blame for expressing sexuality. The narration directly addresses this issue in the passage:

> Like all who have been previsioned by suffering she could, in the words of M. Sully-Prudhomme, hear a penal sentence in the fiat, "You shall be born," particularly if addressed to potential issue of hers.
>
> Yet such is the vulpine slyness of Dame Nature that till now Tess had been hoodwinked by her love for [Angel] Clare into forgetting it might result in vitalizations that would inflict upon others what she had bewailed as a misfortune to herself. (191)

The Supernatural narrator knows that Woman, according to the Miltonic command, is "born" the bringer of Sin and Death into the world. Women are previsioned by suffering and the Supernatural narrator knows that there is a penal sentence in that previsioned knowledge. Dame Nature, in her slyness, has endowed Woman/Goddess with an instinctual sexuality that causes them to bewail that sexuality as a misfortune to themselves. The Supernatural narrator tells the reader that:

> The severity of the decree seemed deadly to Tess: she saw his view of her clearly enough: he could regard her in no other light than that of one who had practised gross deceit upon him. Yet could a woman who had done even what she had done deserve all this? But she could contest the point with him no further. (198)

Again, as the *Other that knows* in the text, Tess supernaturally narrates the deadly decree that she must face at the end of her palingenesic journey. Angel, as yet, can see only

from the Miltonic command's point of view, which states that Eve/Woman practice gross deceit on men by way of their instinctual sexuality. Tess asks in the supernatural narration if Woman could deserve "all this." Tess narrates that she could contest the point with Angel no further, and that her road of trials on her palingenesic journey will ultimately continue to the return threshold. At the return threshold the Supernatural narrator knows that Tess will re-emerge from the kingdom of dread and will redeem Eve/Woman with the boon of Otherness in the mythic narrative that will restore the Goddess to her prehistorical purity.

CHAPTER 5

REDEMPTION AND THE OTHER: THE INTERTEXTUAL (SUB)VERSION OF THE MILTONIC COMMAND

At the nadir of Tess's palingenesic journey she lays herself down on a sacrificial altar at Stonehenge. She asks Angel, "Did they sacrifice to God here?" (Hardy 311). Angel replies "No," then adds, "I believe to the sun. That lofty stone set away by itself is in the direction of the sun, which will presently rise behind it" (311). Tess knows that she has reached the nadir of her journey and falls asleep. Soon the sun rises over the stone and a "ray shone on her unconscious form, peering under her eyelids and waking her" (312). Unconscious(ly), Tess has consummated a sexual union with the goddess-mother (Mother Goddess) of the world as represented by the sun shining on her and waking her with a ray under her eyelids. This motif of

> the sun as a goddess, instead of as a god, is *a rare and precious survival from an archaic, apparently once widely diffused, mythological context*. The great maternal divinity of South Arabia is the feminine sun, Ilat. The word in German for the sun (*die Sonne*) is feminine. Throughout Siberia, as well as in North America, scattered stories survive of a female sun. (Campbell, *Hero* 211; emphasis added)

Given the mythological evidence, Tess has clearly entered into a sacred marriage with the prehistoric (archaic) Mother Goddess Asherah, the "Creator of all Deities." This palingenesic sacred marriage becomes an expansion of consciousness and of *being* that

elevates Tess's status as Goddess ever higher. Tess's sacred marriage with the Mother Goddess becomes yet another transfiguration during her palingenesic journey, all the while being narrated by the Supernatural narrator.

Tess's final step in her journey is to enter the return threshold, which is the gallows and her ultimate death. However, prior to this step the Goddess must leave behind the transcendental powers that helped her along on her road of trials. Tess chooses to leave these powers with her sister, Liza-Lu. At Stonehenge Tess has a conversation with Angel that sets up this transfer of transcendental powers. Tess says:

> "Angel, if anything happens to me, will you watch over Liza-Lu for my sake? . . ."
>
> "I will."
>
> "She is good, and simple, and *pure*. . . . O Angel—I wish you would marry her, if you lose me, *as you will do shortly*. O if you would!"
>
> "If I lose you I lose all. . . . And she is my sister-in-law."
>
> "That's nothing, dearest. People marry sister-laws continually about Marlott. And Liza-Lu is so gentle and sweet, and she is growing so beautiful. O I could share you with her willingly *when we are spirits*! If you would train her and teach her, Angel, and bring her up for your own self! . . . She has all the best of me without the bad of me; and if she were to become yours it would almost seem *as if death had not divided us*. . . . Well—I have said it. I won't mention it again." (311; emphasis added)

Tess knows that she is about to die. Her conversation with Angel is clearly designed to set up the transference of her transcendental powers to Liza-Lu and, by association,

Angel. Tess points out that Liza-Lu is pure and that she (Tess) would be willing to share her with him "when we are spirits." The implication of this statement *appears* to mean that once the transference has occurred, all three will be spirits together in the wake of Tess's palingenesic resurrection.

Once Tess has been apprehended by the authorities at Stonehenge and taken to be hung at Wintoncester, two people ascend quickly toward the town "with bowed heads, which gait of grief the sun's rays smiled on pitilessly" (313). One is Angel Clare, "the other a tall budding creature, half girl, half woman—*a spiritualized image of Tess*, slighter than she, but with the same beautiful eyes—Clare's sister-in-law Liza Lu" (313; emphasis added). Tess's transference of her transcendental powers has occurred in Liza-Lu's spiritualized image of her. When Angel and Liza-Lu reach the top of the great West Hill the clock strikes eight, signifying the time and hour of the Other. The notes of the clock seems to paralyze them both. As they "entered upon the turf" of the hill they hesitate as if "impelled by a force that seemed to overrule their will," and then they "suddenly stood still, turned, and waited in paralyzed suspense by [a mile] stone" (313). They look down on the cornice of the tower where the flag staff is fixed. A few moments after the bell had struck the black flag that signified Tess's hanging rises slowly up the staff and:

> "Justice" was done, and the President of the Immortals had ended *his* sport with Tess. And the d'Urberville knights and dames slept on in their tombs unknowing. The two speechless gazers bent themselves down to the earth, as if in prayer, and remained thus a long time, absolutely motionless: the flag continued to wave silently. As soon as they had

> strength they rose, *joined hands again, and went on*. (314; emphasis added)

The President of the Immortals (the archive/Miltonic command) had ended *his* sport with Tess. The Supernatural narrator implies that *his* "Justice" *was not* "done"; however, a "Justice" will be done by Tess as an *otherwise than being* in the narrative concentricity of intertextual unconsciousness. In the meantime, having transferred her transcendental powers to Liza-Lu and, therefore, Angel, Tess has conferred a redemption in *Tess* that elevates both characters to the level of spiritualized beings. Liza-Lu thus represents "both the same and the other [as Tess's sister], a living on into the future, a renewal of time, an interruption, a discontinuity. The child lives beyond my death and establishes a relation with the absolute future, infinite time" (Handelman, *Fragments of Redemption* 205). Tess also achieves this same status at the time of her death because in the interval before death, "the will has time for the Other, and thus to recover meaning despite death" (Levinas, *Totality and Infinity* 236). At the moment of her death Tess has time for the Other and enters the time and hour of the Other. Despite her death Tess, as Other, as *otherwise than being*, enters the dimension of accomplishment in an eternal return. In the black flag's phoenix motif,

> the destruction of life is only an appearance; it is the destruction of the appearance of life. One buries or burns what is *already dead* so that life, the living feminine, will be reborn and regenerated from these ashes. The vitalist theme of degeneration/regeneration is active and central throughout this argument. This revitalization . . . must first of all pass by way of the tongue, that is, by way of the exercise of the tongue *or language*, the

> treatment of its body, the mouth and the ear, passing between the natural, living mother tongue and the scientific, formal, dead paternal language. (Derrida, *Ear of the Other* 26; emphasis added)

Tess's death represents the ancient form of the killing of the god(dess) in his/her human incarnation. This killing of the god is a necessary step toward revival or resurrection into a better form or existence. The Goddess's (Tess's) resurrection is a beginning that elevates her into a *purer* form and "a stronger manifestation of it" (Frazer 349). Tess, as the living feminine, is reborn and regenerated from the ashes in the phoenix motif. As Other, Tess re-emerges from the kingdom of the dread and returns to bring a boon to the world in the form of an *otherwise than being* that enters the unconsciousness of the intertext to narrate a (sub)version of the Miltonic command. Tess enters language passing between the archive, the dead paternal language, and the living mother tongue to recover meaning despite death. As an *otherwise than being* Tess enters the altarity, the nonsite, that exists in the narrative concentricity of incessantly sliding symbolic orders.

Having achieved a purer and stronger manifestation of her palingenesic Goddesshood, Tess, as an *otherwise than being*, marks a "transcendence of the feminine" that consists of a "withdrawing elsewhere" (Levinas, *Time and the Other* 88). This withdrawing elsewhere is a withdrawal into altarity, which is a "movement opposed to the movement of consciousness" (88). While Levinas does not see this movement as being either unconscious or subconscious but "mystery," the fact that the movement is in opposition to the movement of consciousness suggests that it folds easily into unconsciousness. In the nonsite of altarity, then, the *otherwise than being* moves into the unconsciousness of the intertext and narrative concentricity. As a result of this

movement Tess inhabits narrativity, or discourse itself. This movement into altarity also allows Tess to inhabit the mythic narrative (the one glorious narrative of myths as a whole) and gain relative control of mythic time and narrative time. Because mythic time and narrative time both reside in *alterity*, Tess is able to gain enough control in her altarity to effect a Saying in the Said. *Alterity* is "time itself" and tends to break up reality into "an unrecuperable past and an unreachable future" (26). This effect in *alterity* has the tendency to "disrupt the natural complacency of being" and "overloads it," thus "charging it with a greater responsibility than its capacities can handle" (26). This greater responsibility than *alterity's* (or time's) capacities to handle means that "the future and past are not present, thus in a sense they *are not*" (Cohen 12). Time, then, in the *alterity* of narrative concentricity (or time itself) is "an infinite distance without distance" (13). The mythic narrative also encompasses this infinite distance without distance. It is really in the mythic narrative that Tess effectively uses her presence-in-absence in altarity as an *otherwise than being.* Tess is, in essence, an otherwise-than-Being-in-the-mythic narrative. However, since the mythic narrative exists in the incessantly sliding symbolic orders of narrative concentricity, Tess is able, through altarity, to enter into the *alterity* of the Said and effect a Saying of the unsaid history of the Goddess. She is therefore able to enter the archive (the Said) through her altarity and reveal that Eve was stripped of her genealogic relationship to the Goddess Asherah. Tess is able to accomplish this redemption in the Said because:

> Saying is never *present* in the Said, for the Said is too late and too early, is already caught—no matter how subtle or brilliant its vibrancy—within *the economy of truth and self-presence*. Saying enters the Said *otherwise*

> than the vibration or play of the Said: it is *traced* in the Said, *as a subversion*, both as the possibility of unsaying or resaying the Said—the *pure future*—and as the disruption, the *hurt* [Cohen's emphasis], to which the egoist subject [the archive] passively submits, in patience, in suffering, already striking the egoist subject in a vulnerability it can never ground or recuperate—the immemorial past. The structure of such a relation—both ethical and significant: the proximity of the Other, non-in-difference, the for the other, the Saying of the Said [is] . . . *dia-chrony* or *emphasis*. (Cohen 22; emphasis added)

By entering the Said through her position in the altarity of the mythic narrative Tess effects a diachrony that allows her to unsay the Said. Tess enters the Said otherwise, as an *otherwise than being*, an narrates a (sub)version of the economy of truth and self-presence that constitutes the archive. As an otherwise-than-Being-in-the-mythic narrative Tess narrates the Saying of the Goddess's history that is an unsaying of the Said. Tess's (sub)version of the Said reinstates the Goddess's history and re-establishes the Goddess in her prehistoric purity. Tess effects a past in the Said that "*was never present* and a *future which never will be present*," a pure future (22). Tess's (sub)version of the Said gains both the pure future and the immemorial past. This gaining of both the pure future and immemorial past is the essence of mythic time because *myths are beyond time*. As an otherwise-than-Being-in-the-mythic narrative Tess appropriates mythic time in her unsaying of the Said. The Goddess's history is therefore established in this altarity and the *attempted* obliteration of the Goddess is successfully negated to the extent that the commandment placed on Eve is lifted—she is redeemed. Therefore, by entering the

Said as an *otherwise than being* to narrate a (sub)version of its truth and self-presence, Tess initiates a *command* of the Other. The Other's command negates the Miltonic command and decenters the truth and self-presencing in Milton's *Paradise Lost*.

The Other's command now resides in Tess's unsaying of the Said and enters narrative concentricity. Once Tess's Saying enters narrative concentricity it occupies the *alterity* of the incessantly sliding symbolic orders in the unconsciousness of the intertext. Tess's Saying in the Said now extends throughout the unconsciousness of the intertext effecting a remembrance of the Goddess's other history, the other history the Miltonic command *forgets*. This remembrance of the Goddess's history in Tess's Saying flows throughout discourse affecting a subversion of the patriarchal commandment that Woman is the bringer of Sin and Death into the world. The Other's command brings into the unconsciousness of the intertext a remembrance of the genealogic relationship Eve has with the Goddess Asherah, a remembrance that was once successfully repressed by the archive. Because this remembrance now flows throughout the intertext by way of altarity, it may not be negated. Eve's redemption and the Saying of the Goddess's history are now firmly established in the mythic narrative (and narrative concentricity) where its remembrance will remain. In effect, Tess's Saying in the Said, and her appropriation of mythic time in altarity, effects an eternal return in which her Saying is eternally renewed in archival discourse. The archive no longer has the power to negate the Goddess's history because Tess's Saying in altarity guarantees that it will eternally return in narrative concentricity effecting a remembrance that will always remain in the unconsciousness of the intertext. As this remembrance eternally returns the language of the Goddess becomes a *libido sciendi* that the unconsciousness of the intertext will be

unable to repress. By entering the unconsciousness of the intertext as an *otherwise than being* and narrating the unsaid Saying of the Goddess, Tess has truly entered her dimension of accomplishment and completed her palingenesic journey. She has returned from the kingdom of the dread (patriarchy) and has become successful in the time and hour of the Other. As an *otherwise than being* in the unconsciousness of the intertext, the *Other that knows*, Tess brings a palingenesic boon (knowledge/elixir) to the world by lifting the Miltonic command from Woman, the Goddess, and Eve.

Tess's eternal return in the Saying that now resides in the *alterity* of narrative concentricity allows her to eternally return as the Supernatural narrator and narrate both her own story in *Tess* and the Goddess's story in the archive. Tess's palingenesic death and resurrection at the end of *Tess* allows her, as Other (*otherwise than being*), to retrieve "a meaning and an obligation that is a rupture in the natural order of being," one that is "super-natural" (Levinas, *Time and the Other* 115). Although Levinas implies that supernaturalness in this regard is improperly understood, there can be little doubt that Tess achieves a supernatural existence upon her death that goes beyond her immense stature as a Goddess.

As the Supernatural narrator, Tess successfully narrates a (sub)version of the Miltonic command in altarity that decenters the "new scripture" that Milton hoped to achieve in his *attempted* master-narrative. By gaining relative control of mythic time the Supernatural narrator also restores the transcendence of myth that is almost lost in a "fixed" master-narrative such as *Paradise Lost*. Tess's Saying in the Said regains not only her own purity but the purity of Eve by revealing Eve's genealogic relationship to the Goddess Asherah. As a result of this Saying that now resides in the *alterity* of

narrative concentricity, the Goddess returns (and eternally returns) to her status as the ancient "Creator of all Deities." The Supernatural narrator manages, in the Saying, to return all Goddesses to the Mother Goddess that the mythic narrative had placed at its pinnacle since its origin. If the Goddess has been returned to her origin by way of the Supernatural narrator's Saying, then "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God" has been successfully decentered as well (John 1.1) The Word of God appears to come after the Saying of the Mother Goddess, who was there first, and the Logos that is the archive has been well and truly subverted in that Saying. Not only does Tess successfully redeem Eve by narrating a (sub)version of the Miltonic command in the altarity of narrative concentricity, she also completely decenters the power of the patriarchal archive by re-placing the Goddess in her rightful place *before* the "Word was with God." Shirley Stave states that in *Tess* "the power of the patriarchy becomes greater than Tess' power, and she is destroyed" (111). Given the supernatural nature of Tess's palingenesic journey in *Tess* wherein she achieves palingenesic death, resurrection, and a return as the Supernatural narrator to narrate a powerful Saying in the archive, the patriarchy hardly seems to have destroyed Tess. Tess, it appears, has destroyed the patriarchy, and in the process she takes the Miltonic command down with it. Having successfully redeemed Eve and restored the Goddess's Saying in the Said, Tess causes Milton's concentric, archival discourse to slide incessantly out of control in narrative concentricity as a (sub)version of the Said in the Saying of the Goddess's other history. As a result of Tess's (sub)version of the Miltonic command and all that it stood for, the Goddess is now very much alive and well in narrative concentricity and the archive has suffered a powerful blow to its authority in the process.

WORKS CITED

Becker, Ernest. *The Denial of Death*. New York: Free Press, 1973.

Belsey, Catherine. *John Milton: Language, Gender, Power*. New York: Blackwell, 1988.

Bloom, Harold. *A Map of Misreading*. New York: Oxford UP, 1980.

---. *Ruin the Sacred Truths*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1989.

Boothby, Richard. *Death and Desire: Psychoanalytic Theory in Lacan's Return to Freud*. New York: Routledge, 1991.

Campbell, Joseph. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1973.

---. *The Power of Myth*. New York: Doubleday, 1988.

Chetwynd, Tom. *Dictionary of Symbols*. London: Aquarian, 1993.

Cohen, Richard A. Introduction. *Time and the Other*. By Emmanuel Levinas. Trans. Richard A. Cohen. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1987.

Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Trans. Eric Prenowitz. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996.

---. *Dissemination*. Trans. Barbara Johnson. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1981.

---. *The Ear of the Other: Otobiography, Transference, Translation*. Trans. Peggy Kamuf. Ed. Christie McDonald. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1988.

---. *Of Grammatology*. 1967. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1976.

---. *Writing and Difference*. Trans. Alan Bass. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1978.

Felman, Shoshana. "Turning the Screw of Interpretation." *Literature and Psychoanalysis: The Question of Reading: Otherwise*. Ed. Shoshana Felman. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993. 94-207.

Ferry, Anne. *Milton's Epic Voice: The Narrator in* Paradise Lost. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.

Figes, Eva. *Patriarchal Attitudes*. New York: Fawcett, 1970.

Fish, Stanley. "Interpreting the *Variorum*." *Reader-Response Criticism from Formalism to Post-Structuralism*. Ed. Jane Tompkins. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1980. 164-184.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. 1969. Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon, 1972.

Frazer, George James. *The Golden Bough*. New York: Macmillan, 1963.

Gallop, Jane. *Reading Lacan*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985.

Gibson, Walker. "Authors, Speakers, Readers, and Mock Readers." *Reader-Response Criticism from Formalism to Post-Structuralism*. Ed. Jane Tompkins. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1980. 1-6.

Hamilton, Edith. *Mythology: Timeless Tales of Gods and Heroes*. New York: Mentor, 1969.

Handelman, Susan A. *Fragments of Redemption: Jewish Thought and Literary Theory in Benjamin, Scholem, and Levinas*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1991.

---. *The Slayers of Moses: The Emergence of Rabbinic Interpretation in Modern Literary Theory*. Albany: State U of New York P, 1982.

Hardy, Thomas. *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*. 1891. New York: Norton, 1990.

Harrison, Jane Ellen. *Mythology*. New York: Harcourt, 1924.

Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. 1927. Trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. New York: Harper, 1962.

---. *On the Way to Language*. Trans. Peter D. Hertz. New York: Harper, 1982.

---. *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper, 1975.

Heng, Geraldine. "Feminine Knots and the Other *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. *PMLA* 106 (1991): 500-14.

Hill, Christopher. *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution*. New York: Penguin, 1994.

Iser, Wolfgang. "The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach." *Reader-Response Criticism from Formalism to Post-Structuralism*. Ed. Jane Tompkins. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1980. 50-69.

Kelly, Maurice. *This Great Argument: A Study of Milton's* "De Doctrina Christina" *as a Gloss upon* Paradise Lost. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1941.

Kerrigan, William. *The Prophetic Milton*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1974.

Kramer, Heinrich, and James Sprenger. *Malleus Maleficarum*. Trans. Reverend Montague Summers. New York: Dover, 1971.

Lacan, Jacques. "Desire and the Interpretation of Desire in *Hamlet*." *Literature and Psychoanalysis: The Question of Reading: Otherwise*. Ed. Shoshana Felman. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993. 11-52.

---. *Écrits: A Selection*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Norton, 1977.

---. *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*. Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller.

Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Norton, 1981.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Otherwise than Being, or Beyond Essence*. 1974. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1981.

---. *Time and the Other*. Trans. Richard A. Cohen. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1987.

---. *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. 1961. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1969.

MacCaffrey, Isebel Gamble. *Paradise Lost as* "Myth." Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1959.

May, Rollo. *The Cry for Myth*. New York: Dell, 1991.

Miller, J. Hillis. *Fiction and Repetition: Seven English Novels*. Cambridge, Harvard UP, 1982.

Milton, John. *Complete Poems and Major Prose*. Ed. Merritt Y. Hughes. New York: Macmillan, 1957.

Mitchell, Giles. "Narcissism and Death: A Study of Angel Clare in Hardy's *Tess of the D'Ubervilles*. *Panjab University Research Bulletin* 20 (October): 1989.

Neumann, Erich. *The Great Mother*. Trans. Ralph Manheim. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1972.

Nietzsche, Frederich. *Hammer of the Gods*. London: Creation, 1996.

Ragland-Sulluvan, Ellie. *Jacques Lacan and the Philosophy of Psychoanalysis*. Chicago: U of Illinois P, 1987.

Riffaterre, Michael. *Fictional Truth*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1990.

---. *Semiotics of Poetry*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1978.

Shattuck, Roger. *Forbidden Knowledge*. New York: St. Martin's, 1996.

Shlain, Leonard. *The Alphabet Versus the Goddess*. New York: Viking, 1998.

Stave, Shirley A. *The Decline of the Goddess: Nature, Culture, and Women in Thomas Hardy's Fiction*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood, 1995.

Stone, Merlin. *When God was a Woman*. New York: Dial, 1976.

Waldoff, Leon. *Keats and the Silent Work of Imagination*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1985.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. Ed. Carol H. Poston. New York: Norton, 1988.

Yoder, Paul R. "Clarissa Regained: Richardson's Redemption of Eve." *Eighteenth-Century Life*. 13.2 (1989): 87-99.

.